



ALB. Martin

THE HOME LIBRARY.

JOHN HUS.

*THE COMMENCEMENT OF RESISTANCE
TO PAPAL AUTHORITY ON THE PART OF
THE INFERIOR CLERGY.*

BY

A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A.,

VICAR OF MANORBIER;

LATE HEAD MASTER OF THE GRAMMAR SCHOOL, BURY ST. EDMUNDS;

FORMERLY FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF SCIENCES IN BOHEMIA.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE;

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, CHARING CROSS;

43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET; 48, PICCADILLY;

AND 135, NORTH STREET, BRIGHTON.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG AND CO.

1882.

PREFACE.

No biography of the celebrated JOHN HUS can reasonably be considered complete without an outline of the recent investigations and publications in Bohemia, which have at length rendered it possible to place this extraordinary man in the full light of day before the British reader.

After the destruction of the liberty, both religious and political, of Bohemia in the Thirty Years' War, the chronicle of HAJEK (1541) was universally accepted as the basis of Bohemian history. This chronicle has been incontrovertibly proved by documentary evidence, and is now generally acknowledged, to have been the work of one who might more justly be regarded as the falsifier than the recorder of the history of his country. No uncorroborated statement of Hajek's is now considered to be of the slightest historical value, or to possess the slightest weight as historical evidence. But in 1831, the estates of the kingdom of Bohemia were allowed to appoint a historio-

grapher of their own. The choice fell upon one, than whom none worthier could have been selected, the late Dr. FRANCIS PALACKÝ. The result of his labours has been a magnificent History of Bohemia in five large octavo volumes, "mainly from documents and manuscripts," from the earliest times to the year 1526. The first volume was published in German in 1836, and in 1845 appeared the first part of the third volume, which deals with the "floruit" of Hus. This was both interpolated and mutilated by the censorship of the press at Vienna, which was not abolished till the year of revolutions, 1848. Still this partially garbled account of Hus produced such a sensation, that Baron HELFERT was commissioned to write in Bohemian an account of Hus and Jerome, which should in some wise counteract the effect produced by Palacký's narrative. Baron Helfert's work appeared at Prague in 1857 (287 pp., large 8vo).

In 1842, PALACKÝ read before the Bohemian Society of Sciences, and afterwards submitted to the censorship of the press with a view to publication, an account in Bohemian of the "Precursors of Husitism in Bohemia." This remained so long under the consideration of the censor, that Palacký withdrew it altogether, in order to avoid the anticipated "damnatur." It was, however, translated into German by Dr. J. P. JORDAN, and published in 1846 under his name at Leipsic, without attracting any attention. But in 1869, the remain-

ing copies were reissued with a new title-page at Prague by the original author, and the value of the work was immediately acknowledged.

In 1849, Professor W. W. TOMEK published the first volume of his "History of the University of Prague," in the Bohemian language, in which he carried the narrative down to the year 1436.

Between 1865 and 1868, the late K. J. ERBEN, Archivarius of the Old Town of Prague, published in three carefully edited octavo volumes (containing respectively 478, 440, and 346 pages), John Hus's collected writings in the Bohemian, or Czeskish, language ("*Mistra Jana Husi sebrané spisy České*"), many of which were then printed for the first time. Until the appearance of these volumes, almost all knowledge of Hus had been derived from incorrect editions and translations of his 'Postilla,' and from the account given of him in the edition of his Latin works published at Nuremberg in 1558, and again in 1715 (two folio vols. bound in one).

In 1869, PALACKÝ issued a large octavo volume of 768 pages, containing all extant documents, Latin or Bohemian, relating to the life and case of Hus, and to the religious controversies in Bohemia between 1403 and 1418.

In 1870, PALACKÝ published the second *Bohemian* edition of the first part of his third volume, restoring the portions struck out, and rejecting the passages interpolated, by the censorship, and generally enlarging and revising the whole.

In 1875, Professor W. W. TOMEK published in Bohemian the third volume of his "History of the City of Prague," (*Dejepis Mesta Prahy*), which goes over the same ground as Palacký's vol. iii. pt. 1., but enters into far greater detail with regard to matters that occurred at Prague, where Hus spent the greater part of his life. I have also corresponded with Professor Tomek with respect to points of difference between himself and Palacký, and take this opportunity of acknowledging both his personal kindness and the merit of his writings, which are models of research, care, and clearness.

I have given this account of the above works in chronological order, with the view of exhibiting at once both the facts themselves and also the difficulties which the Bohemians have had to contend with in investigating and writing the history of their country and nation. Such difficulties have for some time been completely at an end, and the press is now as free in Bohemia as in Britain.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

CONTENTS.



CHAPTER	PAGE
I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PRECURSORS OF JOHN HUS IN BOHEMIA...	50
III. JOHN HUS, FROM HIS BIRTH TO HIS BREACH WITH ARCHBISHOP ZBYNEK	75
IV. SECESSION OF THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN THE UNI- VERSITY. CONTEST BETWEEN THE KING AND THE ARCHBISHOP	108
V. JOHN HUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS AT VARIANCE WITH ARCHBISHOP ZBYNEK	126
VI. JOHN HUS IN CONFLICT WITH THE PAPAL POWER	159
VII. JOHN HUS IN EXILE FROM PRAGUE	191
VIII. JOHN HUS AT CONSTANCE	226
IX. JOHN HUS'S TRIAL	262
X. JOHN HUS'S CONDEMNATION AND MARTYRDOM	308
XI. JOHN HUS AS A SCHOOL DIVINE	338
XII. JOHN HUS AS A WRITER IN HIS NATIVE LANGUAGE	349
XIII. JEROME OF PRAGUE	376

JOHN HUS.



CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

THE duty of the historian of the latter portion of the fourteenth and the early portion of the fifteenth centuries in Europe is a very sad one. Almost everywhere it is his to write of decline and decadence, of goodness unable to raise its head from the ground into which it was trampled by unblushing shamelessness, and of iniquity sitting enthroned in the highest places. And this he finds especially true of the Church and the professing ministers of the gospel, with whom religion was, to a great extent, a mere source of gain, and the clerical condition a mere means of ensuring immunity in crime. The clergy were for the most part emancipated from the control of the laws and the jurisdiction of the secular magistrates; and their corruption was pre-eminent in the general

corruption of the age. Was no one to arise in righteous indignation, and to call for the suppression of evil and the encouragement and development of good? Was there none of Christ's ministers who would dare to testify against his evil and degraded brethren, and cry aloud for a real and not a seeming and hypocritical reform in the Church of Christ? Yes! there was one man who ventured so to do—one man who ventured to quit his own country and home, where he was comparatively safe and protected by powerful friends, and to place himself dauntlessly in the hands of the very people whose wickedness he was exposing, and against whose licentiousness and selfishness his purity and morality of life were a living protest.

But it must not be supposed, that JOHN HUS, like Luther or Calvin, was a great doctrinal reformer, assailing positions deliberately taken up and maintained by the Church of Rome, and in that point of view a direct precursor and herald of the Reformation. He was a better and truer Catholic, aye, Roman Catholic, than those who condemned him. He was a true son of his Church; and while he raised his voice against the sin and evil that defiled her, and the practical setting up of the traditions of men above the Word of God, he stood second to none in his reverence for her doctrines, her creeds, and her formularies. Still it is true, that but the slightest traces of Mariolatry and saint-worship are to be found in his writings. It is true also, that the doctrinal abuses and ex-

travagancies, against which he specially protested, have to a great extent disappeared from the Church of Rome herself. It is on the one hand, as a reformer of life and morals, especially among the clergy, and on the other, as a dauntless champion for the rights of conscience and the supremacy of Scripture, that we must contemplate John Hus; and it was as such, that he was foully murdered by one of the most wicked assemblies that ever disgraced the name of council.

But how was it that such a man should have arisen in Bohemia, and not in some other country, speaking some other language, and possessing a literature of world-wide renown—the study of which is an education in itself? The answer to the question is easy, though scarcely credible, save to those whose studies have placed them in full and certain possession of the facts. The state of education and average general culture in Bohemia was higher than that of any other country, and the Czesko-slavonic language had reached a pitch of flexibility and cultivation which had not been attained by any other European tongue save that of Italy, where it was rather poetry than prose that was in the ascendant.

First and foremost among the causes which led to the general spread of education and culture in Bohemia, was the foundation of the University of Prague, in 1348, by the Emperor Charles IV., son of the blind king of Bohemia, John of Luxemburg, who fell in the battle of Crécy in 1346. A noble

layman, educated at that university, THOMAS of STITNÝ, a prose writer of the highest class, may be said to have formed the Bohemian as a literary language, and thus to have rendered Hus, and the widespread movement which he inaugurated, possible.

"A sermon of St. Augustine's," says Stitný, in his work *Of General Christian Matters*, "has encouraged me to be bolder in writing Bohemian books, which relate to the Holy Scriptures; for from it every one can see how good a thing it is to read the Holy Scriptures. And those who condemn books in the Bohemian language, even if good ones, wishing perhaps to be the only persons who appear wise, might well dread the vengeance of God, when they reflect how guilty those are who would wish to stop the letters and necessary messages therein, and to prevent the Lord God, the Eternal Bridegroom, from teaching His Bride His will, and comforting her in her distress thereby. Yea, justly would he be in terror, who should stop the letters of a king addressed to his queen, if he knew that the king was aware of it. And how much greater is the Lord God than any king! How much dearer to Him is His Bride—that is every soul that longeth for Him—than was any queen dear to any king! Wiser men understand this and know that a Bohemian is as precious to Him as a Latinist."

The Czechian nation or "language" received a thorough scientific as well as theological training, through the philosophical as well as theological writings of Stitný, and was as well prepared to enter into controversy with the pen as with the sword. That Wycliffe, though a greater thinker and reasoner, produced, comparatively speaking, so much smaller immediate results in England than Hus in Bohemia, appears due to the fact,

that the English language was not yet sufficiently matured for a great national and intellectual movement to be carried on in it. Had Chaucer, that "well of English undefiled," who is generally considered to have made our language what it is, preceded instead of following Wycliffe, the history of England might possibly have told a very different story as regards the reformation of religion.

But leaving the special circumstances which evoked and rendered possible such a person as Hus and such a movement as the Hussite movement, let us cast our eyes over the condition of Europe generally, a little after the commencement of the last quarter of the fourteenth century. The year 1378 was one of the most fatal epochs known to history. The popedom and the empire were during the middle ages the principal forces in central and western Europe; and the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom, Pope Gregory XI. and the Emperor Charles IV., were both of them swept away within a brief interval of each other during the course of that unfortunate year. And after their deaths, partly through discord, and partly through the absence of morality, steadfastness, uprightness, and capacity in their successors, both the Papal see and the Imperial throne fell into such decay and discredit, that the rise and development of a third power opposed and adverse to them became almost a matter of necessity. This came to pass first in Bohemia with irresistible energy, and later

with varying vigour and success in almost all other European nations.

The first and most important circumstance that gave the turn to the scale for evil at this epoch was unquestionably the outbreak of the great schism in the Church of Rome. The College of Cardinals was at the time of the death of Gregory XI. mainly composed of Frenchmen, most, though not all, of whom had reluctantly followed Gregory from quiet Avignon, where the papal court had resided for sixty years, to troublous and malarious Rome. There were strong reasons for expecting that the future pope would return to Avignon and leave to decay and ruin old Rome, once the glorious mistress of the world, but now almost dependent upon the presence of the papal curia, if not for actual subsistence, at any rate for some small shadow of material prosperity. The Romans, therefore, at the meeting of the conclave on April 7th, 1378, left no means untried to obtain the election of a Roman, or at any rate of an Italian, who would be likely to take up his residence permanently at Rome. On the day of election, April 8th, they assembled in large numbers, came in arms before the conclave, and threatened the cardinals with death, if they did not make their choice in accordance with the feelings of the people. The Roman cardinals, especially those of the Orsini family, were afterwards accused of not being altogether strangers to these tumultuous proceedings, and that with the view of causing the choice to fall

upon one of their own number. But, whatever truth there may be in the accusation, they were at any rate utterly unsuccessful as regards their alleged aim and object, and a temporary cessation of party spirit and strife in the conclave brought about the unanimous election of one who was not a cardinal at all, Bartholomew of Prignano, Archbishop of Bari. The tumult without, while the election was going on, might well be cited as evidence that the choice of the cardinals was not altogether free; but the fact that they did not venture to publish the name of the person elected at once to the populace, but put them off by evasions and subterfuges, till the violence of the storm had passed, is also good evidence that it was not altogether compulsory. Had they been perfectly free they would probably not have selected an Italian at all; had they really acted under compulsion, their choice would probably not have fallen upon the Archbishop of Bari. But for the full validity of the election the following facts may well be considered decisive: (1) That, when order was restored, no voice of protest was lifted up against the new pope, who assumed the name of Urban VI.; and (2) That all the cardinals, without excepting even those who had remained behind at Avignon, recognized and did homage to him, and announced his election and coronation in bulls subscribed with their own hands to the emperor and to collective Christendom.

Pope Urban VI. was learned, frank and upright,

a man of rigid morality, vigorous and unbending in his zeal for religion and God's service, and withal a declared enemy to everything in the shape of simony. But he was proud, domineering, harsh and hard even to cruelty, self-willed and obstinate, although not altogether inaccessible to the flatterer, and given over to the most unbounded nepotism. The zeal that he undoubtedly possessed for the extirpation of the countless and deeply rooted abuses that were existing and flourishing, was far too deficient in the requisite prudence and kindness to attain its desired end. He wanted to commence reform with the cardinals and highest dignitaries of his court; but public expostulations, reproofs and threats were scarcely, under the circumstances, the most eligible means to begin with. The variously aggrieved and mortified cardinals quitted Rome during the heat of summer under pretext of the malaria, met together at Anagni, and there found leisure to compare notes and communicate to each other their discontent at the election that they had made. Were courtly French gentlemen to be put to scorn and shame by a rude and overbearing Italian? Were not the discomforts of Rome sufficient, without perpetual inquiry into little peccadilloes, to which long custom had all but given a quasi-sanction? Return to Avignon was proposed to Urban, who rejected the proposal briefly and decidedly, but was withal unwise enough to make by uncourteous and disrespectful treatment an enemy of Duke Otto of Brunswick, husband

of Joanna, Queen of Naples, who was sent to him on the mission. Thus the malcontent cardinals obtained protection and encouragement, not only from the King of France, who was only too happy to enjoy the éclat of the residence of the pope in his territories and as it were under his protection, but also from the Queen of Naples. Finally, four months after the election and coronation of Urban VI., the cardinals formed the resolution of declaring the act of the conclave extorted by tumult, and therefore canonically invalid.

No sooner did knowledge of the threatening schism reach the ears of the Emperor Charles IV., than he sent his commissioners to the cardinals, urging and adjuring them to stop in what they had so unhappily begun, to return from their evil way, to reconcile themselves with Urban VI., and thus to prevent the ruin that was impending over the Church.

“It becomes the imperial majesty of the world,” wrote he, “to promote the welfare of the state, and wholesomely to provide against the baneful perils of discords, especially those by which the condition and desired tranquillity of the Holy Church of God are injured, so far as the Most High deigns to allow it. Verily the fleeting loquacity of Fame hath greatly disturbed men’s ears with a horrible matter, how that certain lord cardinals are setting about opposing themselves to Pope Urban VI., and have separated from him under certain colourable pretexts. . . . Whereas, from the letters of the major part of the aforesaid lord cardinals, transmitted to us successively after the election and coronation of our aforesaid lord the pope, which we have commanded to be kept in careful custody, it is most

clear and evident, that the aforesaid our lord the pope, unanimously and canonically elected and solemnly crowned, hath, with you present and consenting to him, performed several, yea, manifold acts, and has with just title made them papal acts, in assemblies both public and private, we wonder greatly, and with good reason, whether a separation of this kind—a thing which nevertheless we do not believe—rests on a basis of truth. Who among you, most reverend cardinals, can have stood forth as a seducer, and not as a cardinal, malevolently sowing tares so scandalous in the fields of the Holy Church of God ?”

Hearing soon afterwards, that the cardinals had betaken themselves from Anagni to Fondi, in the territory of Naples, Charles called also upon the Queen of Naples, in a letter of similar tenour, to prevent her vassal, the Count of Fondi, from giving any assistance to them in their apostasy. But, being in full understanding, not only with the Queen of Naples, but also with the powerful King of France, they considered their position completely secure, and on September 28th, 1378, elected, at Fondi, one of their own number, Cardinal Robert of Geneva, anti-pope, in opposition to Urban, under the name of Clement VII. The selection was made far more in accordance with the dictates of worldly policy than from any motives connected with religion or the spiritual welfare of the Church. Near akin to the royal family of France, and more distantly connected with the House of Luxemburg, and thus with the present wearer of the Imperial Crown, it was hoped that he would without difficulty obtain general recognition. But the Emperor Charles IV. refused to entertain the idea of a

second pope for a moment, and became, unsought, the most faithful, active, and energetic supporter of Urban VI. His emissaries hastened with letters, not only to the princes of the empire, but to almost every court in Europe, exhorting all to steadfast adherence to Urban, and refuting the manifesto of the apostate cardinals. Charles was Roman emperor, and, as such, chief protector of the Christian Church; he felt himself, therefore, bound in conscience to make head against the mighty evil that was commencing. Long, too, had he striven to obtain, and had at length succeeded in obtaining, the return of the papal court from Avignon to Rome, and had thus rescued it from the overwhelming ascendancy of France. But now the success of his policy was rendered doubtful by the prospect of Clement VII.'s return to Avignon.

The schism being now complete, the principal ecclesiastical authorities, and withal, the three universities that held the highest rank in Europe, those of Paris, Oxford, and Prague, cried aloud for the convocation of a general council. It then became a question by which of the rival popes it was to be convoked, but the majority of contemporary authorities agreed in the opinion, that under such circumstances this duty appertained to the Roman emperor. Thus the opinion expressed by many of Charles's contemporaries appears to have been not altogether groundless, that the personal esteem in which he was held,

and the personal influence, as well as the acknowledged prudence, ability, and energy, which he possessed, would probably, ere long, have succeeded in suppressing the new-born schism, had he not been carried off by a fever on November 29th, 1378, in the 63rd year of his age.

Whom, then, did he leave as his successor in this difficult and delicate task? His eldest son, Wenceslas IV., surnamed the Lazy, whose election as king of the Romans Charles had procured by no very honourable means, and contrary to all precedent, during his own lifetime. Wenceslas IV. was a spoilt child from the first, and a spoilt child he remained throughout the whole of his life. Indolent and good-natured, though subject to violent fits of passion, he was never so happy as when, casting the cares of royalty on the shoulder of a brother or a cousin, he devoted himself to the pleasures of the chase in the vast woods and forests of Krivoklat or Zwikow. There was nothing that he loved and admired so much as a huge dog, and his agents were constantly employed abroad in seeking and procuring for him these objects of his affection. The largest of them all was an inmate of his bedroom, and slept at his feet; and it was commonly believed that the sudden death of his first wife, Queen Joanna, was due to this monster, who seized her by the throat when she rose from her bed in the dead of the night. Tall, and powerful in stature, Wenceslas

was well read, and spoke Latin excellently, while a single anecdote is sufficient to prove his wit. Accustomed in the early part of his reign to go about at night incognito with a band of companions, partly for frolic, partly for the purpose of redressing wrongs, and observing the conduct of subordinate officials, he once found the words *Wenceslaus alter Nero*, written upon a wall. He immediately took a piece of chalk and wrote under them a rhymed completion of the couplet: *Si non fui, adhuc ero*. He endeavoured to rule by personal sway, like his father, but never, like him, attained to the power of ruling himself. That he was not a man of good and delicate taste, is shown by the obscene embellishments with which he caused his bible, which is still in existence, to be disfigured; and as he grew in years, he became more and more devoted to the pleasures of the table and the bottle. In a position to which he was unequal, with a better will and better intentions than any of his contemporaries, and never unpopular among the *people* of his realm, his name has gone down to posterity as that of the weakest and most unsuccessful monarch of his day. Nor was it one of his smallest difficulties, that his father by will partitioned his dominions amongst his sons, assigning Brandenburg to Sigismund, and the newly-created Dukedom of Görlitz to John, while his nephews, Jost and Procop, inherited the Margravate of Moravia from their father. To Wenceslas fell Bohemia, Silesia, parts of Bavaria and Saxony,

and the portion of Lusatia which was not included in the Dukedom of Görlitz.

How was it with the other states of Europe? There was but one ruler who ruled with success and ability, and that was a woman. Margaret of Denmark, the celebrated foundress of the Union of Calmar in 1397, governed with vigour and prudence in the north of Europe from 1376, first as guardian of her son, and afterwards in her own right. But, though Scandinavia prospered and flourished, she exercised but little influence on the course of events throughout the central and southern portions of the Continent. Edward III., of England, had been called away in 1377, leaving the crown to his grandson Richard II., who was but thirteen years old at his accession, and whose incapacity and dismal fate are too well known to be worth dilating upon. France, too, three years later lost her Charles V., surnamed the Wise, who had greatly restored his country and raised the power of his crown after the terrible blows inflicted by the English, attaining his ends by measures which were always clever and prudent, if not altogether just and righteous. His son and successor was Charles VI., who was only twelve years old at the time of his father's death, and the regency was made use of by his uncles for their own selfish ends, so that the land was desolated by misgovernment and misery. And when Charles became old enough to take the reins of government into his own hands, it was not long

before he sank into a melancholy condition of mental derangement, with lucid intervals but few and far between. King Louis of Hungary and Poland, a man of high and distinguished personal character, died in 1382, leaving only two daughters behind him, under the guardianship of an ambitious and unscrupulous mother, whose characteristics were rather vanity and cunning, than pride and prudence. Spain was divided into several kingdoms, and engaged in the death-struggle with the slowly receding Moor.

Thus throughout the rest of Europe there was, as Palacký says, a kind of equilibrium of weakness, while in Germany not the smallest trace of patriotism was to be found among the greater or lesser possessors of power. All was sunk in the deepest selfishness, no one thinking of aught but the advancement of his own power or the increase of his own territory, and every one utterly careless as to the morality of the means to be employed for the purpose. In the cities alone appeared now and then a comforting exception, to show that there still remained a germ of goodness. The supremacy of the emperors had been broken down ever since the days of the Hohenstaufen, and was now rather ideal than real, depending entirely upon the personal qualities or military ascendancy of the wearer of the crown. The emperor himself was practically looked upon by the great princes of the empire, as merely *primus inter pares*, and was little more than the head of an oligarchical republic. The great

aim of the princes was to convert their fiefs into independent sovereignties, while the inferior nobility and the towns endeavoured to secure themselves against them, like the Swiss, by leagues and confederacies. Charles IV. had never seized the opportunity of allying himself with the people and inferior nobility, to break the ever-increasing power of the princes, but had merely endeavoured by adroit and skilful diplomacy to calm the troubled waters and prevent active encroachments and usurpations. He gained thereby no gratitude from any one, but left difficulties preparing for his son and successor, which none but a master-hand could have successfully encountered or disentangled.

So long as the experienced advisers of his father lived, Wenceslas exhibited zeal and energy towards putting an end to the great schism in the church, and towards the restoration of public peace and quiet in Germany. Not many weeks after his accession, he convoked a diet at Nuremberg, but it was an evil omen that very few of the princes of the empire appeared there, either in person or by their plenipotentiaries. At a second diet, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, he was more fortunate, and resolutions were passed, that Germany would maintain internal peace at home and unanimously join the king in espousing the cause of Urban VI. Neither the ambassadors of the anti-pope, nor those of the King of France, were allowed an audience, and it was plainly stated to the latter, that it was not their king, but the future emperor, that was the

natural advocate and protector of the Holy Roman Church, whose duty it was of right to provide for the well-being of the pope and the Holy Christian Faith. After this Clement VII. thought it no longer safe to remain in the territory of Naples, but placed himself under the more powerful protection of the King of France, at Avignon. He was followed by the great majority of the existing cardinals, so that Urban VI. was under the necessity of surrounding himself with a fresh body of those princes of the Church.

Wenceslas found little difficulty in suppressing the germs of schism in his own inherited crown lands; but in Germany, in spite of the resolutions of the diet, there were many powerful princes, who were only too ready to seize every opportunity of turning the contest between the rival popes to the furtherance of their own selfish ends and interests. And, to the great misfortune of both Wenceslas himself and the land of Bohemia, it came to pass, that all the principal councillors of Charles IV., by whom he had hitherto been guided, were swept away by the hand of death in 1380, whether by the plague, which then raged in Bohemia, or otherwise, we are uninformed. Thus far his reign had been merely a continuation of that of his father; he was now compelled to come into the foreground himself with all his personal failings and deficiencies. He was, however, able to settle the long dispute and warfare between the rival claimants to the archbishopric of Maintz, and by means of an exchange

of bishoprics in Bohemia and Germany, to establish Adolphus of Nassau at Maintz, as a pronounced adherent of Urban VI. Here, however, all serious endeavours on the part of Wenceslas with regard to the schism came to an end. Finding that France was not to be induced to cease from supporting Clement VII., he renewed the ancient friendship and alliance between the houses of Luxemburg and Valois, without the slightest reference to the discord in the Church, a proceeding which produced a very painful impression on the mind of Urban.

A grand superstructure of hope had been raised by the French cardinals upon the negotiations, which had been begun in 1380 by the French court, to effect a marriage between their youthful King Charles VI., and Wenceslas's young and amiable sister Anne. Cardinal Pileus, Urban's legate in Bohemia, naturally exerted himself to the utmost to bring this project to nothing, and to favour the rival proposals of King Richard II. of England; and before the end of 1381 the princess made her public entry into London. Her arrival was signalized by an amnesty, which she obtained for several political prisoners, and, later, frequent acts of intercession of a similar kind and other beneficent actions earned her the name and memory of "the good Queen Anne." Not only did she bring new fashions across the water with her, but also, what at that day was far more extraordinary, a copy of the gospels in three languages, as Wy-

cliffe himself informs us—Bohemian, German, and Latin—which she was in the habit of studying diligently. The celebrated Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, eulogized at her death the extraordinary love she exhibited towards Holy Scripture, and the diligence with which she studied it in the English language; in this respect far surpassing many dignitaries of the Church. There is also reason to think, that the continual and intimate intercourse, which she kept up with her brother and her fatherland, was not without its influence upon the great events that afterwards came to pass in Bohemia.

Wenceslas went so far in accordance with the wishes of Urban, as to break off intimate relations with the French court, although neither Urban nor Richard could prevail upon him to enter into an alliance against it. Finding, however, that Urban persisted in appointing bishops in Germany, nay, actually in Silesia, without the slightest consideration for his wishes, Wenceslas wrote the pope a letter full of complaints and even of threats, and the cardinal legate in consequence quitted Bohemia. Still a reconciliation was so far brought about, that the king made arrangements for visiting Italy in the April of 1383, to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the vicar of Christ, a prospect which filled all patriot hearts in Italy with joy, as they desisted therein grounds of hoping for aid to put a stop to the proceedings of the wicked Charles of Anjou and his worthless Frenchmen in the south. But the

condition of Germany prevented the execution of this project. The terms of the general "land-peace," which was agreed upon in the diet at Nuremberg on March 11th, 1383, with its division of Germany into four parts, all bound to keep peace together and to unite in quelling any disturbance thereof, appeared to the cities to assign more power to the princes and princely lords than was consistent with their interests; nor was it till July 26th, 1384, that Wenceslas was able to induce the parties to consent to an agreement to live in harmony for the short space of four years, a truce which was, however, eventually of much shorter duration.

Bohemia itself enjoyed, during the first part of Wenceslas's reign, uninterrupted peace and quiet internally, and an amount of prosperity rarely to be found during the middle ages. No doubt this was mainly due to the measures and management of the late Emperor Charles IV., who appears to far greater advantage as the wise and beneficent King of Bohemia, than as the shifty and time-serving Emperor of Germany. But the silver mines of Kuttenberg, the extensive commerce of the city, and the celebrity of the University of Prague, and the lightness of taxation in the country at large, all contributed to this fortunate result.

Several of the highest offices had become hereditary in certain noble families, and had thus sunk into mere honorary titles. Among the chief members of the council for home affairs were Wenceslas's cousins, Jost and Procop, the Margraves

of Moravia, and the Archbishop of Prague, John of Jenstein, while but few of the great officials of the court and country were included in it. Over and above this great council Wenceslas organized for himself a kind of cabinet or camarilla, composed principally of gentlemen of the inferior order of nobility, and even of citizens of Prague, who were entirely devoted to his person. Under their influence the clergy were treated with little consideration, and ere long the king came into collision with his Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of Prague, in whose heart a severe illness combined with other circumstances had caused gaiety and worldliness to make way for asceticism and spiritual pride, and who was now prepared to meet his sovereign in the tone and temper of Thomas à Becket. A dispute having arisen between the archbishop and the king's favourite, John Czuch of Zasada, as to the right of constructing and maintaining a weir on the Elbe, and the archbishop having betaken himself to the use of violence for the purpose of enforcing his claims, the king in anger summoned him to Karlstein, kept him in durance several days, deprived him of the office of chancellor, and authorized Czuch to reimburse himself by forays upon the lands of the archiepiscopal see. In the skirmishes that thus occurred is found the first certain instance of the use of firearms in Bohemia.

King Louis of Hungary and Poland died on September 11th, 1382, and his eldest daughter Maria, then only twelve years old, who was betrothed to

Wenceslas's next brother, Sigismund, was crowned "King" of Hungary on the 17th of the same month. Wars and disturbances intervened, and the actual marriage did not take place till October, 1385. Finally Sigismund found himself obliged to renounce all claim to the throne of Poland, but was solemnly crowned King of Hungary on March 31st, 1387, with the crown of St. Stephen at Stuhlweissenburg. This elevation brought about fresh arrangements in the House of Luxemburg, by which Brandenburg was assigned in mortgage to Margrave Jost, Wenceslas's cousin; Wenceslas himself received the revenues of the silver mines at Kuttenberg, and Sigismund resigned all claim to the succession to the Bohemian crown in favour of the youngest brother, John of Görlitz.

In 1387 the internal peace of Bohemia was disturbed for the first time, by a local insurrection which so enfeebled the king's power of enforcing obedience in Germany, that a civil war broke out between the princes and the cities, in which the cities suffered a decisive defeat on August 24th, 1388, at Döffingen. After this, Wenceslas, weary of a nominal sovereignty, to which no one paid any regard, appears to have seriously contemplated the abdication of the dignity of King of the Romans.

Wenceslas, who had lost his Queen Joanna by sudden death in December, 1386, now, in 1389, entered into a second marriage with Sophia of Bavaria, a young and handsome princess, pious and kindly, who never varied in the most faithful

attachment to her husband under the most discouraging circumstances. This match exercised a considerable effect upon subsequent events, as the queen eventually took up a position favourable to the party that was calling for reform in the Church.

At the diet at Eger, in April and May, 1389, Wenceslas was compelled to declare the illegality of the confederation of his former allies, the German cities, and to dissolve it. Meanwhile a terrible persecution of the Jews broke out at Prague, of which Wenceslas, though accused by his enemies as "detested by the clergy and people, the nobles, the citizens, and the peasants, and acceptable to the Jews alone," took advantage to direct a considerable portion of the Jewish wealth into his own coffers.

On October 18th, 1389, Pope Urban VI. died, and was succeeded at Rome by Cardinal Peter Tomacelli, who was crowned on November 9th, under the name of Boniface IX. To him Urban bequeathed the carrying out of two decrees: (1) the introduction throughout Western Christendom of the festival of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, a pet project of the Archbishop of Prague, John of Jenstein, who had unsuccessfully striven to establish it of his own authority in his own diocese; (2) the shortening of the period of recurrence of the Christian year of Jubilee. This period had been already reduced by Clement VI. from a hundred to fifty years, but was now to be further

diminished to thirty-three years, the duration of the life of Christ upon earth, and at the same time the average duration of human life. It was therefore decreed that the year 1390 should be the first year of Jubilee at Rome under this novel reckoning, and crowds of pilgrims streamed thitherward from all parts of Europe to perform the prescribed processions and acts of penitence in the appointed churches, and to participate in the indulgences granted in return.

Boniface IX. was personally a far more agreeable pope to deal with than the gloomy, strict, and arrogant Urban VI., and we find King Wenceslas now thinking seriously about the requisite journey to Rome to receive the imperial crown. But he again deferred it till after the completion of the year of Jubilee at Prague, which was to commence on March 13th, 1393. The king and his youthful queen were among the first to perform the required ceremonies, although not altogether without dispensations. The crowd was enormous, although just then a breach occurred between the king and the archbishop, which threatened to invalidate the religious exercises of the festival entirely.

The archbishop had become extremely jealous of the least infringement of his ecclesiastical privileges and immunities, and had gone so far as to excommunicate the king's under-treasurer for arresting several students of the university, and even with the king's privity and knowledge causing two of them to be executed. No complaint was made of any

injustice, but merely of the violation of privilege involved in the proceeding. And when the king had come to an arrangement with the pope to erect the Abbey of Kladrau (*Kladruby*) on the death of the then aged abbot, into an episcopal see, the archbishop caused the monks to proceed so rapidly with the election, and his vicar-general with the confirmation, of a successor, that the king heard of the death of the old, and the election and confirmation of the new abbot at one and the selfsame time. The passionate nature of the king was by this excited to fury, and though some of his councillors endeavoured to effect a reconciliation between him and the archbishop, yet when they met on March 20th, the rage of Wenceslas was such that the archbishop was obliged to escape as best he could, several of his clergy and officials were maltreated, and two of them cruelly tortured. One of these, the vicar-general, John of Pomudk, was thereby so seriously injured, that his death was certain, and the king finally ordered him to be carried to the bridge, which connects the Old Town of Prague with the Kleinseite, and thence cast into the river Moldau, as a terror to those of the clergy who might be inclined to dispute his will.* John of Jenstein naturally be-

* This historical personage was afterwards divided into two persons, one real and the other imaginary, with an interval of ten years between them, by the chronicler Hajek (1541). Through the suppression of the Bohemian language and literature the legend could not be properly tested, and the Roman Curia actually

took himself to Pope Boniface, but found little favour in his eyes, partly because he was really in the wrong in interfering with an arrangement which had already received the pope's sanction, and partly because Wenceslas had meanwhile laid Boniface under a considerable obligation by detecting the papal collector in Bohemia in fraud, and thus saving a large sum of money for that ever-necessitous pope.

Wenceslas now began to feel the evil effects of his attempts at personal government. His cruel conduct towards some of the most respected dignitaries of the Church made a deep impression, of which the great lords, discontented at being practically thrust into the background, while the government was carried on through a camarilla of inferior rank, were not slow to take advantage. A league was formed, mainly through the exertions of Lord Henry of Rosenberg, which was joined by Margrave Jost of Brandenburg and Moravia, Wenceslas's cousin, and even by King Sigismund of Hungary, his brother. Duke John of Görlitz, and Margrave Procop of Moravia, who was already at war with his elder brother Jost, were the only members of the House of Luxemburg that remained faithful to Wenceslas. Sigismund played a double part. He visited his brother at Prague, formed a

canonized the WRONG ONE under the name of St. John Nepomuccen, in 1727. See the documents fully set forth in my "Life, Legend, and Canonization of St. John Nepomuccen." 1873. Palacký wrote me on March 12th, 1872: "In my judgment, *Saint John Nepomuccen* belongs solely to legend, in no wise to Bohemian history."

fraternal alliance with him, and declared him his heir presumptive in Hungary, while at the same time he came to an understanding with the malcontent lords as to the means to be employed for the overthrow of the obnoxious camarilla. As Wenceslas was on his way from his favourite castle of Zebrak to Prague, Margrave Jost and the barons with Henry of Rosenberg at their head, came to him at one of his country houses on the road, laid their grievances before him, and finally arrested and conveyed him first to Beraun and then to the Hradschin at Prague. They then endeavoured to constitute Margrave Jost "starosta," or dictator of the realm, leaving Wenceslas nothing but the empty title of king.

Their sentiments were not, however, shared by the people at large; the citizens of Prague declared in favour of the king, the lords who had remained faithful rose also in his behalf, and Duke John of Görlitz soon found himself at the head of a large army before the gates of the Old Town of Prague, which were opened to him. The malcontent barons thought their prisoner no longer secure in the Hradschin, and carried him off first to Pribenitz, then to Krumau, a strong town in the south of Bohemia belonging to the lords of Rosenberg, and finally, with great secrecy, to the castle of Wildberg. But the devastations committed on the lands of the principal lords of the league by John of Görlitz and his army, at length compelled them to give way, and Wenceslas was, on August 1st, 1394,

delivered up to his brother under promise of a complete amnesty and redress of grievances.

These events had a very evil effect upon the temper and character of the king, who became gloomy and vacillating, though no less obstinate and passionate than before, and a tendency to drink began to develope itself in him. He again assembled his favourites around him, and the league of malcontent nobles began again to raise its head. Duke John undertook the thankless task of mediator, but was unable to satisfy his brother, who harshly and ungraciously deprived him of his high position in the country, and issued decrees forbidding any further obedience to be yielded to his orders. The duke quitted Prague, and on March 1st, 1396, died suddenly at the Abbey of Neuzelle.

Sigismund of Hungary had hitherto kept himself in the background, but now came forward as mediator, taking, however, practically the part of the league against his brother, and assigning him a privy council, but one member of which was a faithful adherent of his own, all the rest being nobles of the league. Wenceslas suddenly arrested Margrave Jost, and several of the leading members of the league, at Karistein, on May 31st, 1396, but, ere long, again released them. This caused a great increase of embitterment in the feelings of the nobles towards the king, and the most libellous writings were composed and circulated against him. War appeared ready to

break out afresh, but the storm fell instead upon the heads of the king's favourites. On June 11th a meeting of the council was summoned at Karlstein, under the pretext of important intelligence from Germany; four of the favourites were called out by some of the lords into a smaller room hard by the council chamber, and were there attacked and murdered.

The king was in a country house near Beraun at the time, and the murderers rode to him immediately, and, on bended knee, informed him of the treasonable intentions of his favourites, assuring him that they had committed the deed out of pure love and loyalty towards himself. And Wenceslas was actually weak enough to grant them a public pardon for their conduct, Margrave Jost being, however, banished from Prague and Bohemia, as being, in all probability, the real instigator of the catastrophe.

Possibly Wenceslas may have felt that he had no alternative but to make concessions to the league, as he could not but be aware of the intrigues that were being actively carried on against him in Germany and Italy. He determined to make a visit of some duration to Germany, and appointed Margrave Procop his lord-lieutenant in Bohemia. The "land-peace," which he had patched up at Eger in 1389, had long been at an end; his attempts to prolong it had been fruitless; and his nomination of King Sigismund on March 13th, 1396, as his vicar in the empire, had been

a nullity, as the victorious Sultan Bajâzet had made matters assume far too threatening an appearance for Sigismund to attend to aught but the pressing necessities of Hungary. In Germany there was no supreme executive, the laws were powerless, and an anarchy was rampant, which must have been distressing even to those who were profiting by it. Loud were the complaints on all sides raised against Wenceslas's negligence; yet no one was willing to give him the slightest assistance in the efforts which he did make for the restoration of order, while every readiness was shown to increase his difficulties and frustrate his best intentioned measures.

We now come to one of those disgraceful transactions, by which the papacy endeavoured, as it were, to bring itself into contempt and disrepute. The Chapter of Maintz had regularly elected, and Wenceslas had confirmed, a new archbishop after the death of Archbishop Conrad in 1396. But Count John of Nassau, a disappointed candidate, managed, in spite of Wenceslas's protestations, to induce the needy Pope Boniface by a heavy bribe to impose him upon the diocese by virtue of a special "provision" of the apostolic see. His chief supporter was Ruprecht, the elector palatine, who had long formed designs upon the imperial crown, and had obtained from Count John a formal promise in writing to assist him in every way, whatever might be the position of dignity to which he should aspire.

Wenceslas also, on May 11th, 1395, granted the title of duke to John Galeazzo dei Visconti, the able ruler of Milan, whereby he secured for himself a faithful and powerful adherent, but made a deadly enemy in the wealthy and powerful republic of Florence. The Florentines soon entered into relations with the discontented princes of the empire, and the elevation of the Visconti family became afterwards the most serious charge brought against Wenceslas by the electors, this important act having been performed entirely without their knowledge. Wenceslas, however, succeeded in assembling a general diet at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in obtaining a "land-peace" in Germany for the space of ten years, which was accordingly proclaimed on January 6th, 1398. But on March 3rd, the elector palatine, and the Archbishops of Maintz and Trier, had the audacity to shorten its duration to five years on their own authority.

Charles VI. of France now appears on the scene, as one endeavouring to put an end to the prolonged scandal of the great schism in the Church. France and Spain alone had devoted themselves to the pope at Avignon, all the rest of Christendom adhering to the pope at Rome. Clement VII. had died in 1394, and Peter of Luna, Benedict XIII., an Arragonese, had been elected by the cardinals at Avignon, contrary to the wishes of Charles. Charles, therefore, at the instance of the University of Paris, put forward proposals, in which he was

supported by the kings of England, Castille, and Navarre, that both popes should resign simultaneously, that the two colleges of cardinals should be fused into one, and that a new pope, who should command universal obedience, should be elected by the united college. The action of the University of Prague induced Wenceslas reluctantly to give up his allegiance to the ungrateful Boniface, and assent to this project, which was opposed by those who might have been expected to co-operate with it to the utmost, the count palatine and the Archbishops of Maintz and Trier.

Wenceslas now determined to visit France, and was met on March 23rd, 1398, by King Charles and the princes of his family, before the gates of Rheims, and welcomed as a relative with the highest honours, the greatest care being, however, taken to exclude all idea of homage and all recognition of any imperial power over France. Wenceslas appeared to little advantage before the dainty manners and politeness of the French court, and his coarseness and the over-indulgence of his appetite caused many an anecdote to be whispered about at Rheims. Nay, as early as March 25th, when he was engaged to dine with Charles, the Dukes of Berri and Bourbon went to his lodging to accompany him to the palace, but returned in shame and perplexity, having found him already sunk in the deep sleep of gluttony and intoxication. No very definite engagements were entered into

during the visit to France, and Wenceslas returned again to Germany, and thence to Bohemia.

He then, however, appeared to take greater interest in the plan suggested for the removal of the great ecclesiastical scandal, and it was finally agreed that the Kings of Hungary and of Poland, with divers other princes, should meet him at Breslau, at Christmas, 1398, to consider the restoration of the unity of the Church. But when the time approached, Wenceslas was attacked by so serious an illness, that all thoughts of the congress were of necessity abandoned, and ere his recovery events occurred which put an end for the time to all negotiations on the subject.

Early in 1399 the nobles of the league began to move again, and a civil war broke out in Bohemia, to which neither King Sigismund nor the Elector Palatine, Ruprecht, appear to have been strangers. Very little is known respecting the details of the struggle, but on June 15th, an armistice was concluded till January 6th, 1400, during which interval all matters in dispute were to be settled by eight elected umpires. However, the land did not so easily regain the blessings of peace, although the ill-will of the malcontents appears to have been directed, not so much against Wenceslas himself, as against Margrave Procop, whom he had made his viceroy in Bohemia during his absence in Germany, and also during his late severe illness. Margrave Jost and others visited Sigismund at Buda, accusing Procop of being the

“origin and fomentor of all the discord in the land of Bohemia;” and on January 18th, Sigismund appeared in armed alliance with the league at Iglau, in Moravia.

These disturbances in Bohemia offered just the opportunity that the Rhenish electors desired. They won over Rudolf, the Elector of Saxony, and took every means to strengthen their party by new alliances, while Wenceslas was vacillating with regard to both imperial and domestic troubles, and only half-heartedly defending his hitherto faithful cousin, Procop. In hopes of drawing, at any rate, some of the Bavarian princes to Prague, Wenceslas caused his Queen Sophia to be crowned with the usual pomp and ceremony in the cathedral, on March 15th, 1400. But no brother, no cousin, or other relative of the queen appeared at the coronation, which was only attended by princes of the House of Luxemburg and the great nobles of Bohemia, whose hostility even prevented the presence of Margrave Procop. In vain did Sigismund and Jost counsel Wenceslas to enter Germany at the head of an army; for with their usual selfishness they reopened the war against Procop at home, and thus deprived their brother of the power of availing himself of the military resources of his realm.

Energy on the part of Wenceslas and union in the House of Luxemburg might even now have brought the designs of the electors to nought, their basis being nothing but selfishness and views

of personal aggrandizement. All agreeing in the wish to depose Wenceslas, they were equally at variance as to the choice of a successor. Nay, to such a pitch of discord did they come, that the Elector of Saxony was suddenly assailed by the forces of the Archiepiscopal Elector of Maintz, defeated, and taken prisoner. Duke Frederic of Brunswick, the favoured candidate and son-in-law of the defeated prince, lost his life in the conflict.

And now Pope Boniface IX. began to play a double part, intriguing with the malcontent electors and the princes of their party, while assuring Wenceslas by letter that "there was one thing which he desired him to take for fixed and settled, and that was, that in all matters concerning the position and honour of his highness, he (Boniface) would be watchful and attentive with the unwearied zeal of paternal tenderness, even unto the effusion of his own blood." The malcontent electors cited Wenceslas to appear on August 10th, at Lahnstein, to clear himself from the accusations brought against him—a thing which, in the midst of a civil war at home, it was impossible for him to do, even if he had been willing to submit to so unprecedented an humiliation. On his non-appearance at the appointed time, they proceeded formally to depose him, in a large and splendid assembly at Oberlahnstein, on August 20th. The Archbishop of Maintz read aloud the articles of accusation, the principal of which were—(1) That he had not done his duty as protector of the Church by restoring its peace ;

(2) That he had diminished the empire, in particular by creating Visconti Duke of Milan; (3) That he had given away many fiefs that had escheated to the empire in Germany and Italy; (4) That he had issued documents in blank, which were liable to misuse; (5) That he had not put a stop to the disturbances and feuds of the empire; (6) That he had been guilty of many personal cruelties, especially towards the clergy; (7) That in spite of admonitions he had not troubled himself about either the Church or the empire. "For these reasons," he continued, "the electors had agreed to depose him as an useless, dilatory, negligent dismemberer, and an unworthy administrator, of the holy empire." The next day the three archiepiscopal electors (Maintz, Trier, and Cologne), paying no regard to the three electoral votes of Bohemia, Saxony, and Brandenburg, proceeded to elect the Elector Palatine, Ruprecht, King of the Romans. So little foundation was there for most of the charges brought against Wenceslas, that the German historian, Asehbach, says: "One cannot help marvelling how it came to pass that the Elector of Maintz—the only one who attached his seal to the instrument of deposition, although he professed to be acting in the name of all the electors—had the audacity to lay such charges before the diet."

Wenceslas received intelligence of his deposition on August 30th. He swore by St. Wenceslas to avenge the insult; "either he, or Ruprecht," he

said, "must perish." Margrave Jost, who happened to be just then at Prague, also threatened vengeance, "or he wouldn't keep a single hair in his beard." And for a brief space the four surviving members of the House of Luxemburg appeared to be united, soon—too soon—to be dis-severed by selfishness and greed. Margrave Jost met the lords of the league in consultation as to the measures to be taken; Sigismund came from Hungary to the neighbourhood of Kuttenberg; and it seemed as if the insulted king was about to be assisted and avenged by the whole might of his realm and family. But now came the question of the price to be paid for such assistance. Not only was Wenceslas to bear the entire expenses of the war, which, to his credit, he was willing enough to do; but he was to redress all the old grievances of the lords, as a preliminary to any movement on their part in his favour, and was at once to give up Silesia and Lusatia to Sigismund, and place in his hands the whole government of Bohemia! No wonder that demands so outrageous excited Wenceslas to anger, and that he ordered his horse and rode away without any leavetaking.

It was unfortunate that Wenceslas, in his embitterment, now allowed himself to commit acts of arbitrariness and wilfulness, which in the long run injured himself more than they annoyed his adversaries. Neither did the anti-King of the Romans, Ruprecht, spare any pains to turn the troubles of

his opponent to his own advantage. The lords of the league and Margrave Jost united with him, and even Procop, with his forty castles, was found making terms with the enemy. Ruprecht took several castles and towns belonging to the Bohemian crown outside the frontiers of Bohemia, but when his son Louis attempted an invasion, the people soon showed that they were not of the same mind as the nobles; the old defensive arrangements of Bohemia were equal to the occasion, and Louis was compelled to enter into an armistice on June 20th, 1401. Violence having thus failed, Ruprecht tried the path of negotiation, which, however, led to nothing, owing to the extravagance of his demands.

The Margraves of Meissen now united their forces with those of the league, and appeared in June before the walls of Prague, where they lay inactive for six weeks, while their appearance where no foreign troops had appeared for centuries, and the misconduct of their soldiers, excited a reaction on behalf of the betrayed and hard pressed king. On August 12th, a treaty was signed, in consequence of which the league reconciled itself with its king, and the Margraves retired to their own land. The king was henceforth to be guided by the advice of a kind of regency of four persons, who were to have a veto in various important matters. Jost was conciliated by the grant of Lusatia for life. It may seem strange that King Sigismund is not found taking part in any of these important matters. But he had himself been

arrested and imprisoned by his own rebellious subjects on April 28th, 1401; nor was he liberated until the September of the same year, after which he reconciled himself with the malcontents, and regained authority by prudent concessions.

King Ruprecht now began to busy himself with the affairs of Italy, intending to receive the imperial crown after fulfilling to the Florentines his promise of wresting the Duchy of Milan from the Visconti. But on his way from Trent to Brescia, the gates of which he expected to be opened to him, he was attacked by the Milanese army, which was better disciplined and commanded, if not more numerous, than his own, completely defeated, and compelled to retire with a very small force to Padua. The victorious duke immediately sent an embassy to Wenceslas, urging him to undertake the long projected journey to Rome at once, and telling him that he need bring no army with him; nowhere would he find braver or more devoted troops than those of Lombardy.

And indeed Wenceslas began to think seriously again of the Romeward pilgrimage. But so distrustful of himself and of almost the whole world had he become, and so convinced of his brother Sigismund's intellectual superiority and honesty of purpose, that he placed himself entirely in Sigismund's hands. On February 4th, 1402, he actually resigned to him the entire government of Bohemia, upon condition of being escorted and accompanied by him to Rome to be crowned as emperor. Yet

by March 6th a quarrel had broken out between the brothers, the causes of which are unknown, and Wenceslas was seized by Sigismund in his own palace in the Old Town of Prague, conveyed to the Hradschin, and there detained in strict imprisonment, although all public documents were still made to run in his name.

Sigismund made use of his power to impose grinding taxes in Bohemia for his own purposes, and at the same time allowed himself to commit many arbitrary and cruel acts. This gave Margrave Procop an opportunity to place himself at the head of those barons and royal towns which still remained faithful to the king. A civil war appeared inevitable; negotiations commenced between Procop and Ruprecht, who had seized the opportunity to return with as little loss of honour as possible to Germany; and there was every prospect of combined operations being undertaken against Sigismund. But Sigismund's energy and faithlessness were equal to the occasion. He encamped with his army under the lofty castle of Besig, the Margrave's principal stronghold, and invited him to a conference under the protection of a safe-conduct. Procop came and was immediately arrested; and now that his opponents were without a head, Sigismund easily overbore all opposition, and in June, 1402, conveyed his illustrious prisoners away. He gave out indeed that he was escorting his brother Wenceslas to Rome, to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the

pope, but in reality placed him in the custody of the Dukes of Austria, at Vienna, while he himself kept Procop in strict imprisonment at Presburg.

An insurrection now arose in Hungary in favour of Ladislaw, King of Naples, who landed in August, 1402, in Dalmatia, with an army, and was ere long supported by a legate from Pope Boniface. But Sigismund, justly considering Bohemia for the moment to be more important than Hungary, marched into Bohemia, and compelled the town of Kuttenberg, the most resolute and faithful adherent of the captive king, to capitulate on very unfavourable terms, and to surrender the treasures of Wenceslas there deposited, amounting in value to about £340,000. In the summer he returned to Hungary, more than half of which had acknowledged Ladislaw, who was actually crowned king on August 5th, 1403, by the Archbishop of Gran at Zara. But success everywhere attended Sigismund and his faithful general, Count Stibor, and in October, 1403, after a succession of reverses, Ladislaw was compelled to quit Hungary for ever.

The apparition of Boniface IX., whom Sigismund had always befriended, at the head of his enemies, irritated him greatly, and he proceeded to proclaim disobedience towards the pope with the selfsame energy which he had lately displayed in all his measures. In Bohemia this seed found soil ready prepared for it; in Hungary the consequences were comparatively unimportant. Sigismund also ad-

addressed a letter to the College of Cardinals, containing the most grievous accusations against Boniface.

All this time Wenceslas was at Vienna, where the Dukes of Austria allowed him to hold a court and to ride out daily in the town and in its environs. The more contented he appeared with his condition, the less care was taken in guarding him. Thus, with the help of a Maltese knight, named Bohus, and other faithful friends, he escaped in disguise on November 11th, 1403, to the bank of the Danube, where a fishing boat awaited him, which conveyed him to Stadlau. There he was met by John of Lichtenstein with fifty armed men, who escorted him first to Nicholsburg in Moravia, and then to his faithful Kuttenberg in Bohemia.

The first care of Wenceslas, upon whom his late troubles had produced a salutary impression, was to destroy all traces of his brother's *regime* in Bohemia, and to strengthen himself by alliances for the projected war with Hungary and Austria. Nor was he less energetic in restoring peace and order at home. He sent the Archbishop of Prague with an army against the most dangerous of the robber-knights that infested the country. Not one of the brigand's castles escaped capture, and finally the knight himself was taken with fifty of his men, tried, and hanged at Prague, his only indulgence being that the gallows on which he was suspended was loftier than those of the rest. A great impression was made by this righteous severity; nor were

the hearts of people less touched by the fact that MAGISTER JOHN HUS, the favourite preacher of the day, gave his spiritual assistance to the criminal, accompanied him to the gallows, and brought the wild and ferocious robber into such a penitential frame of mind, that he humbly and earnestly entreated the prayers of the spectators on his behalf. Other vigorous measures were taken; a lord-lieutenant was placed with increased powers at the head of each of the twelve circles, into which Bohemia was divided, and in 1405, internal peace and order were completely restored.

Boniface IX. died on October 1st, 1404, and the excellent Innocent VII. was elected in his stead. He, however, was unfortunately called away on November 6th, 1406, and was succeeded by Gregory XII. War had been carried on with more or less vigour on the Bohemian and Bavarian frontiers with the adherents of the anti-King Ruprecht, and Wenceslas now applied to the new pope for recognition and assistance. To his great annoyance Gregory unexpectedly refused to listen to him and took energetically the side of Ruprecht. Henceforth Wenceslas was Gregory's foe.

After Wenceslas's deposition and imprisonment the French court had given up all idea of the compromise it had proposed, and had returned in 1403 to the obedience of Benedict XIII., making, however, the stipulation that Benedict must promise to resign his dignity as soon as the throne at Rome was vacant. One of the two rival kings of the

Romans, Ruprecht, being devoted to the Roman pope, and the other, the illegally deposed Wenceslas, being without influence and authority, France again took up the project of bringing to pass the desired vacancy at Rome. The elections of Innocent and Gregory had been declared merely provisional, and the latter had actually promised to resign his dignity, as soon as his rival at Avignon should consent to do the same. France even threatened to cease to recognize either pope, unless the desired unity of the Church were attained within a given time by the resignation of both, and proved her sincerity by making the concession, that the future pope should engage to reside at Rome and not at Avignon. A meeting of the two popes at Marseilles was arranged, which was duly attended by Benedict, while Gregory made use of every pretext to avoid performing his promise, and refused to go further on the way than Lucca. The cardinals, however, on both sides negotiated together in spite of Gregory, and on May 11th, 1408, Gregory's cardinals forsook him, met on May 14th at Pisa, under the protection of the Florentines, and issued a manifesto to all Christian princes justifying their conduct. Benedict was also forsaken by his cardinals, and both colleges, supported by France, united at Leghorn and convoked a general council of the whole of Christendom at Pisa.

Wenceslas took up the project of the French court—I do not say of the French king, whose

mental aberration caused the affairs of France to be principally conducted by the Duke of Burgundy—with zeal and energy, confidently hoping to be eventually acknowledged as the true and only King of the Romans, and thus to obtain the imperial dignity. He found, however, unexpected resistance at home, both in the Church and in the university, which led to the adoption of measures, the subsequent effect of which is incalculable, but which will be more properly narrated in immediate connection with John Hus. After much delay and many subterfuges, the cardinals found themselves compelled by Ruprecht's obstinate adherence to Gregory XII. to acknowledge Wenceslas, who sent his ambassadors to the council at Pisa, which opened on March 25th, 1409. On June 5th, the council formally deposed both popes and declared them schismatics, and on June 10th, the cardinals bound themselves by oath not to allow the council to separate till the long wished-for reform of the Church "in head and members" should have been carried through. On June 20th the cardinals met in conclave, and after eleven days of deliberation unanimously elected the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, Peter Filargo of Candia, who took the name of Alexander V. The new pope, disregarding his oath and the oaths of his brother cardinals, immediately proceeded to disappoint the hopes of Christendom by exhibiting the greatest lukewarmness in the cause of reform, by convoking a new council, which was not to meet till April 12th, 1412, and finally by dissolving the

council of Pisa on August 7th, 1409. There were now therefore THREE popes, each of whom had his adherents—Benedict XIII. being acknowledged in Spain and Scotland; Gregory XII. in Naples and some of the smaller states of Italy, as well as in three German dioceses; and Alexander V. by the rest of Western Christendom, with occasional sporadic exceptions. It was Wenceslas's duty, as now the more generally acknowledged King of the Romans, to enforce and secure the unity of the Church; but so far was he from being able to effect this desirable object abroad, that he could not even bring it to pass in his own dominions; nor was it till September 2nd, 1409, that Archbishop Zbyněk of Prague and his suffragan, the Bishop of Olmütz, withdrew their obedience from Gregory XII. and transferred it to Alexander V. On May 30th, 1410, Alexander V. died, and the wicked Balthasar Cossa became pope in his stead, under the name of John XXIII.

Matters now became further complicated instead of simplified by the death of the anti-King Ruprecht on May 18th, 1410. Bohemia, Brandenburg, and Saxony had never acknowledged Ruprecht, so that they did not even entertain the question of a vacancy and new election, while the other four electors, who formed the majority of the college, were equally divided, though all agreed that their choice must necessarily fall upon a prince of the House of Luxemburg. The elector palatine and the Archbishop of Trier still adhered to Gregory XII. and favoured Sigismund, whose personal inclinations were in the

same direction, while the Archbishops of Maintz and Cologne had acknowledged the council of Pisa, and had thus before them only the alternatives of returning to Wenceslas or supporting Jost, the Margrave of Brandenburg. Finding that a new election was inevitable, Wenceslas came to an understanding with Jost, and promised him his own vote on condition that Jost engaged to acknowledge him as the elder King of the Romans and future emperor. After long intrigues Sigismund's party took the initiative by electing him at Frankfort on September 30th, 1410, with only three votes, those of the Palatinate, Trier and Brandenburg, which latter was claimed by Sigismund as well as Jost. On October 1st, Jost was elected by the remainder of the votes, including his own, as actual possessor of Brandenburg, so that the world had then the edifying spectacle, not only of three rival popes, reciprocally anathematizing each other, but also of three rival brothers, Kings of the Romans, and claimants of the imperial dignity. It is true, that the latter spectacle did not continue long, as Jost died suddenly four months after his election, not without grave suspicions of poison. Ere long too, towards the end of June, 1411, a complete reconciliation was brought about between Wenceslas and Sigismund, Wenceslas promising his vote to Sigismund, while Sigismund promised Wenceslas his assistance towards obtaining the imperial crown. So that when these arrangements were carried out—as carried out they were by the unanimous

election of Sigismund, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, on July 21st, 1411—Sigismund, the junior King of the Romans, stood in nearly the same relation to Wenceslas, as Wenceslas had previously stood in to his father, the Emperor Charles IV. Sigismund, moreover, forsook the obedience of Gregory XII., and acknowledged John XXIII. as the true and only pope, so that both Kings of the Romans were now agreed in their policy.

Thus far it has been necessary to proceed with a sketch of contemporary history to enable the reader to understand the state of matters in Europe and Bohemia, when Hus began to come prominently forward. I have narrated the earlier part of the history at greater length and with greater particularity, passing with more rapid outline over those later portions, which will be filled up in the life of Hus. Never was a period in which, in both Church and state, iniquity, faithlessness, and wickedness were more rampant, or in which the destinies of mankind were entrusted to more incompetent and unworthy hands. No one rises above the dull level of selfishness and mediocrity, and the history of the period is a tedious record of knavery and counter-knavery, of faithlessness and incapacity, in which we look in vain for a gleam of patriotism or devotedness. The prize of superior wickedness remained long in dispute, until it was carried off triumphantly by the vicar of Christ himself, Pope John XXIII.

I have made many remarks upon the low condi-

tion and depravity of the clergy at this miserable epoch, and I cannot do better than conclude this introductory chapter with the remarkable admissions made by one of Hus's most bitter and energetic opponents, Magister Andrew of Brod, who concludes his "*Tractatus de Origine Hæresis Hussitarum*," which he wrote in exile at Leipsic in 1426, with the following words :—

"In the clergy there was no discipline whatever ; in the courts of the pontiffs there was public simony ; in the monastic state, if I may use the term, there was unbounded covetousness. And, to make an end, there was no vice among the lay people, which the clergy had not practised first and most notoriously. There is nothing therefore for us to say but this, which the Holy Church reads and chants : All that Thou hast done unto us, Lord, Thou hast done in righteous judgment, because we have sinned against Thee, and have not obeyed Thy commandments."

CHAPTER II.

THE PRECURSORS OF JOHN HUS IN BOHEMIA.

It is a singular circumstance that the first person who must be looked upon as one of the forerunners of John Hus was not a Bohemian at all, but an Austrian naturalized in Bohemia. CONRAD of WALDHAUSEN, an Augustinian monk, was ordained priest in the year 1349, and spent some part of the following year at Rome. He then employed himself in his native country, especially at Vienna, in teaching and in preaching to the populace. Having distinguished himself by his learning and eloquence, he was invited into Bohemia by the Emperor Charles IV., through the mediation of the lords of Rosenberg, and presented with the rectory of Leitmeritz on the Elbe. This was, apparently, in 1359. He resided, however, quite as much at Prague as at Leitmeritz, and used to preach in the open space in front of the church of St. Gallus, there not being room enough for his audience inside the church. In 1364 he was made

rector of the "Teyn" church in the Old Town of Prague, and died at his rectory in 1369, on December 8.

As soon as he commenced preaching at Prague, the churches of the begging friars began to lose their audiences, and in a short time were entirely emptied. Conrad spared neither the luxury of the laity nor the vices of the clergy, and inveighed with special vehemence against the degeneracy of the begging friars, thereby incurring their deadly enmity. He wrote and preached in Latin and German, and the moral reformation which he brought about among the German population at Prague (where the Old Town was mostly German and the New Town Bohemian) caused a still greater preacher, MILICZ of KREMSIER, to arise among the Slavonians, who was harder pressed by calumny and misrepresentation than Conrad had been. Yet Conrad was compelled both to stand a trial before the pope's legate, and to write an "apology" in defence of his teaching and preaching.

A contemporary writer, Benesz Krabice of Veitmil, speaks of his death in the following terms:—

"In the year 1369, on the Feast of the Conception of the Virgin Mary, died the distinguished preacher, Brother Conrad, *canonicus regularis*, rector of St. Mary ante Lætam Curiam, in the city of Prague, and was buried in the cemetery there. An Austrian by birth, a man of great learning and greater eloquence, he saw, when he came to Bohemia, all men given up to excessive luxury, and exceeding all limits in many respects; and through

his preaching, so reformed the morals of people in our country, that many put aside the vanities of this world and served God with zeal. Among the many good things that this man did, was one especially great and memorable. The ladies of Prague, who had hitherto worn large and very magnificent mantles, as well as other clothes ornamented in the most magnificent manner, put aside all these things, and went daily in very humble clothing to hear the instructions of this distinguished teacher and preacher. He preached also dauntlessly against usurers and other unjust possessors of property, and especially against religious persons of both sexes (*i.e.* monks and nuns), who had been received into their Orders through simoniacal practices. As, in consequence thereof, many persons, conscience-stricken by his pious sermons, obtained dispensations from the Holy Apostolic Curia, and others refused to give up their children to the Orders with the stipulated sums of money, all the brethren of the begging Orders rose up against him and loaded him with manifold abuse. But he, a man of perfect love, endured it all with equanimity for God's sake. *Requiescat in pace. Amen.*"

I come now to MILICZ of KREMSIER, about whose parentage all that is known is, that he was the son of plebeian parents in humble circumstances. It is not known for certain where he was educated, but he must have been so either in Italy, or, more probably, in his native country. It could not have been in Germany, or he would not have been obliged to learn German when grown up, in order to preach, as Conrad of Waldhausen had done, to the German part of the population of Prague. Nothing is known of his early life before 1350, and, though he is known to have then held some office or other, no further particulars are recorded.

According to the custom of the times, he, in all probability as a clergyman, held the post of

secretary, first at the court of Margrave John of Moravia, and then at that of the Emperor Charles IV. Between 1360 and 1362 he was considered one of the chief officials in the Imperial Chancery. He was also a canon of the church of St. Vitus in the royal castle at Prague—the present cathedral—and an archdeacon, but it cannot be ascertained when he obtained these dignities. Suddenly, in the autumn of 1363, he resigned all valuable preferments, in order to follow the Lord Christ in poverty and humility.

Archbishop Arnost strove in vain to detain him. “What better thing can you do,” he said, “than help a poor archbishop to feed the flock entrusted to him?” But Milicz thought otherwise, and replied that, as he did not wish to sit in the chief seats, his intention was to try whether he could not be useful to the people by preaching the Word of God. The first place to which he betook himself was Bischof-Teinitz, a small town in the circle of Klattau, where he exercised himself diligently in preaching to the people. But as soon as this mode of life began to be acceptable to him, and he found himself taking, as he thought, inordinate pleasure in the rector’s beautiful garden, he saw in this simple enjoyment a temptation of the evil one, and returned within about a year to Prague, where he preached, first at St. Nicholas’s on the Kleinscitz, and afterwards at St. Giles’s in the Old Town.

At first he had but few hearers, and even some

of these mocked him *propter incongruentiam sermonis*—that is, in all probability, on account of his Moravian pronunciation of the Bohemian language. Gradually, however, his audience increased in numbers, and his severe and cutting words against pride and avarice, as the root of all evil, were soon known throughout the whole of Prague. At length the desire of hearing him became so general, that he was obliged to preach three and even five times a day in different places. He was not only admired by the common people, but the educated classes also were carried away by his eloquence; and the most learned Bohemian of the day, Magister Adalbert Rankonis de Ericino, acknowledged that Milicz had brought together in a single hour more than he could have collected in a month from the most learned authors for the composition of a sermon. “And so concerned was he,” says one of his biographers, “for the salvation of the people, that though he had never made any progress in German in his youth, yet now in his age he began with great zeal to learn the German idiom from his pupil and others, and frequently wrote down in German the whole of the sermon that he was about to deliver, and thus at length he began to preach in German.”

Through his zeal against the moral corruption of the times, and his unceasing study of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Apocalypse and the old prophets, the mind of Milicz became filled with extraordinary ideas respecting the latter days,

the coming of Antichrist, and the destruction and end of the world. He placed the coming of Antichrist between the years 1365 and 1367; and this notion took such firm possession of his mind, that in his oratory he spared neither the spiritual nor temporal heads of Christendom, and in 1366 told the Emperor Charles IV. publicly to his face that he was himself the very Antichrist. The clamour of Milicz's enemies caused the Archbishop of Prague, John Oczko of Wlaszim, to have him arrested; but he was soon liberated again, and neither the archbishop nor the emperor appear to have been seriously angry with him. Becoming, however, doubtful as to the correctness of the results at which, by his studies and calculations, he had arrived, he determined to visit Rome, and obtain the counsel and instruction of the pope, Urban V.

After the papal court had been sixty years at Avignon, Pope Urban V., at the earnest entreaty of the Emperor Charles IV., determined to return to Italy and Rome. Milicz was there before him, and when the pope delayed his coming longer than was expected, the spirit would not suffer him to rest in idleness.

"As I began," says he in his "*Libellus de Antichristo*," "to despair of the arrival of our lord the pope, I made preparations for undertaking a journey to Avignon. Meanwhile the spirit moved in me, so that I could not refrain myself, and said in my heart: 'Go, publish openly by a placard on the door of St. Peter's church, as thou wast wont to do at Prague, when thou

wouldst preach on any subject, that thou wilt preach that ANTICHRIST IS COME; and warn the clergy and people to pray for our lord the pope and our lord the emperor, that they may so order the Church in things spiritual and temporal, that true believers may be able to serve their Creator in safety. And publish the discourse immediately in writing, that thy words may not be perverted or altered, that the subject may be made generally known, that the wicked may be put in fear, and that the good may become more zealous servants of God. But reserve the secret portions of the matter for thy lord the pope.”

As soon as the placard appeared on the doors of St. Peter's, the *Judex Hæreticorum* at Rome, a Dominican, caused Miliez to be arrested in the church itself, and kept him in strict imprisonment in the convent of the Minorites. He was then allowed to preach before an assembly of clergy and other learned men at St. Peter's, by whom his discourse was received with great approbation. Nevertheless, at its conclusion he was taken back to his prison, where, however, he received less rigorous treatment.

But when Pope Urban came to Rome in October, 1368, not only was Miliez liberated at once, but Cardinal di Albano received him into his own house, and distinguished him by tokens of honour and friendship. Nay, his enemies, who had caused him so much discomfort, and who were deprived of their offices under the new state of things, came to him themselves and begged for his intercession in their favour. However, the idea of the appearance of Antichrist seems to have lost its hold upon him in consequence of his conferences with the chief

dignitaries of the church: at any rate, after his return to Prague, it ceased to be a prominent subject of his discourses.

In other respects he preached with still greater zeal in the churches at Prague, at the same time practising a still more ascetic mode of life, and renouncing everything in the shape of pleasure and enjoyment. After the death of Conrad of Waldhausen, in 1369, he took his post in the "Teyn" church, and preached there daily in German, while another clergyman delivered discourses composed by Milicz, in Bohemian, at St. Giles's. A visible proof of the effect of his preaching was the destruction of the notorious "Venice" (*Benátky*) in the present "Convikt-Gasse" at Prague, the females living in which, to the number of one hundred, did public penance, and quitted for ever that stronghold of licentiousness. Milicz was not slow to see that it was his duty to care for the future maintenance and welfare of his penitents, and devoted himself to the task with all the fiery energy of his temperament. At the command of the Emperor Charles IV., this ancient domicile of sin was demolished, and a chapel erected on its site in honour of St. Mary Magdalene. Several neighbouring houses were purchased, and an ample site procured for a house for the penitents, and also for a residence for the young clergy, who became Milicz's pupils and assisted him in the work. This house, which was thenceforth called "Jerusalem," became ere long a refuge for other fallen persons, so that this excel-

lent man had not unfrequently from two hundred to three hundred persons to maintain. Although alms and presents from all quarters were sent to him for this purpose, and many pious ladies took the girls thus reformed into their service, yet Milicz often found himself in such pecuniary embarrassments, that he was compelled to incur debts, and in consequence to suffer many insults from ill-disposed people. Still, all that happened continued to raise the esteem in which he was held, and to increase his influence over the inhabitants of Prague.

The prominence of Milicz excited the envy and hatred of many of his brother clergy to such an extent, that, finding they could effect nothing against him either through the Archbishop Oczko or through the emperor, they drew up an accusation in twelve articles against him, which they sent to the court of Pope Gregory XI., at Avignon, entrusting their case to the advocacy of Magister John Kloukot. This person delivered the twelve articles to the pope, who by his statements was excited to the most violent anger, not only against Milicz, but also against the archbishop, for having allowed such errors to spring up. On January 10th, 1374, bulls were issued, not only to the emperor, the Archbishop of Prague and the Bishop of Litomysl, but also to the Bishops of Ohmütz, Breslau, and Cracow—a proof that the influence of Milicz had penetrated far beyond the precincts of Bohemia, and had extended into Moravia, Silesia, and Poland—in which Gregory complained that true

Christianity was being injured in those regions by Milicz; and required that all that had been thus improperly begun should be put a stop to, "if"—as the bull prudently added—"the fact be such as we have been informed." The aged archbishop was so panic-stricken at this, that Milicz himself was obliged to comfort and encourage him. As the Inquisitor of Prague now rose up armed with papal authority to commence proceedings against him, Milicz appealed to the Roman curia, and went at once, in the Lent of 1374, to Avignon.

On his arrival at the papal court he was welcomed by his old ally, Cardinal di Albano, and no one ventured to interfere with him on account of the twelve articles. Nay, when the cardinal summoned Magister Kloukot into his presence, and asked him the reason why he was exhibiting articles of plaint against Milicz, he admitted that he knew no harm whatever of him himself, but had preferred his complaint at the request of some of the clergy of Prague. It is manifest that Milicz was fully acquitted at Avignon, from the fact that on May 20th he was allowed to preach before the cardinal, who invited him to his table immediately after the conclusion of the sermon.

Soon afterwards Milicz was seized with an illness from which he never recovered. In certain expectation of death, two days before his decease, he dictated two letters, full of piety and magnanimity, one to the lords of Rosenberg and the other to Cardinal di Albano. He died at Avignon on the

festival of St. Peter, *i.e.* either on June 29th, if the ordinary festival of St. Peter be the day, or on August 1st, if it be the festival of St. Peter in Fetters.

In Prague the intelligence of his death caused deep emotion and great lamentation. The work begun by him in the "New Jerusalem" was not continued, and on December 17th, 1374, the house was granted by the emperor to the Cistercian Order, under the express condition that the Theological Faculty of the University of Prague should be allowed to pursue its studies there.

Milicz left several works both in Latin and Bohemian. The most remarkable of these appears to have been one in the Bohemian language: "Of the great torments of the Holy Church and of every faithful soul, which they have to suffer from the dragon in the last days of Antichrist, and of the seven last and worst wounds, whereby he will terribly afflict all the elect of God, and how the elect of God ought to behave in this affliction." His book, although admired and studied by both Catholics and Utraquists, was, nevertheless, placed in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, probably on account of certain passages in which he inveighed against the moral corruption of the clergy in somewhat unsparing language.

It was owing to the advice and urgency of Milicz that Thomas of Stitný commenced that series of writings which formed and consolidated the Bohemian language, and thus rendered that great

national movement possible, which is generally known as the Hussite movement, but which eventually assumed dimensions far beyond anything that entered into the mind of Hus.

Third in chronological order, but first in point of intellectual importance among the precursors of John Hus, stands Magister MATHIAS of JANOW, although much less is known about the details of his life than about that of Milicz. His writings too, remarkable and important as they are, fell shortly after his death into such oblivion—perhaps owing to his recantation—that in the beginning of the sixteenth century portions of them, that were accidentally discovered, were ascribed to Hus, and published along with Hus's genuine works.

His father was Wenceslas of Janow, a poor Bohemian knight, who was still living in the early part of the reign of the Emperor Charles IV. Nothing is known about Mathias's early life, except that he spent some years at Prague, studying under the guidance of Milicz, with whose spirit and doctrine he thus became well acquainted; and that he then went to Paris, and spent six years at the university there, where he took the degree of Master of Arts. Hence he obtained the surname of *Magister Parisiensis*, by which he is much oftener referred to in old manuscripts than by his own name.

That in his younger years, quite counter to the example of Milicz, he strove hard for honour, fame,

and wealth, is acknowledged by himself in the following words :—

“I confess that not long ago I was plagued and possessed by the spirit of Antichrist, full of concupiscence and pestilential pride, striving with great zeal after riches, after fame, and the honours of this world; and for that end I did much, devoted my powers and much expenditure thereto, and competed for four benefices; and now at this present moment one of my rivals is in possession of a benefice that rightfully belongs to me. And, wishing to be rich in this world, I fell deep into the snares of the devil.”

Mathias petitioned Pope Urban VI. for a canonry at Prague, and in the winter of 1380–81, went to Rome himself to urge his suit; which indeed in those days, when the pope had arrogated to himself the right of presentation to all dignities and benefices throughout Christendom, was the shortest and easiest method of effecting his purpose. Later, however, Mathias became one of the most zealous opponents of the pope's *Reservations et Provisions*. He returned to Prague armed with a papal bull, which he laid before the Chapter of the Cathedral of Prague, and was on October 12th, 1381, elected a canon of St. Vitus in the palace at Prague, *i.e.* of what is now known as the cathedral in the Hradschin.

The Archbishop of Prague, John of Jenstein, assigned him the office of confessor in the church of St. Vitus, which he held till his death, on St. Andrew's day, 1393. He was buried in the cathedral.

His principal work is in five books, entitled, "Regulæ," or "De regulis veteris et Novi Testamenti," which Dr. Palacký from its contents would prefer to designate "The Books of True and False Christianity." Four books of this are found in one MS., and the fifth in another, which is especially precious, as having belonged to the author himself. It is now in the library of the University of Prague.

Mathias protested most solemnly and formally against the idea of quitting or in any way violating the unity of the Church.

"I do not intend," he says, "to say or write aught—yea, I intend not to say or write aught—that is contrary to the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, or to the Christian faith, directly or indirectly; that is in anywise contrary to the good customs of the church; or that can in anywise offend the pious ears of a faithful Christian man. But if—which I trust will not be the case—it does happen that I say, write, or think anything contrary thereto, through my ignorance or inadvertence or any other carelessness or imperfection, which I know to be very great in me, I from the first revoke and retract it, begging it to be considered as unsaid. Therefore, and for greater security, I submit these, my words and writings, as also myself and all my other actions, to the correction of the Holy Catholic Church, and to my orthodox fathers, being prepared and desirous in every respect to be corrected, and by my pious mother herself and my fathers to be guided and brought back and brought home (*duci et reduci ac deduci*) to the way of truth and grace made by Jesus Christ in the Church."

No doubt Magister Mathias did differ from the majority of contemporary theologians, and that especially as regards the question whether pious

laymen ought to partake frequently of the sacrament of the Eucharist or not. To this question both Milicz and Mathias replied with the answer "yes," while their opponents met it with the answer "no." Mathias gives the following account of the matter :—

"It ought to be known that at the present time the question respecting the daily or frequent participation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ on the part of laymen has become very important, especially among ordinary and simple people. Some preachers and teachers affirm it, and invite the people to daily or frequent corporal participation in the sacrament of the altar, under the condition of proper previous preparation and a worthy life. There are others who maintain the contrary, and enforce it with great vehemence, endeavouring to persuade the people that it is absolutely not good that the laity should be often fed with the body and blood of Christ."

But at a synod of the archdiocese of Prague, in 1388, the views of Magister Mathias were not only not accepted, but actually repudiated and prohibited, as we learn from himself in a second edition of his first book :—

"Now, however," he says, "'the continual sacrifice,' as Daniel calls it, appears to be done away with, since some men rise up in the Church, and new not only oppose it publicly and in the pulpit, dissuading the people of Christ from frequent communion by their discourses, though they cannot do so by the words of Scripture, but have also publicly by the voice of the crier and solemnly declared their disapproval of the Christian people daily and frequently receiving the body and blood of Christ, laying it down of their own ordinary authority as a law of Christ, that no clergymen, not a priest, and no lay person, however worthy, shall be allowed to receive the sacrament of

the altar oftener than monthly, or once in four weeks. Moreover, the sacrifice appears to be put a stop to at one blow, for in accordance with resolutions of many learned men and priests, and with the consent of the archbishop and dignitaries, this prohibition has been solemnly and publicly proclaimed in the synod of the clergy and in the assembly of the people, to wit, that the inferior clergy and the laity in the Christian congregation are in no wise to be invited to daily or frequent participation in the sacrament. This, however, hath been done, and people have seen it with their own eyes, in the year of the Lord 1388, in the month of October, on the day of the Evangelist Luke. Therefore, immediately thereupon, those preachers and priests who were in the habit of administering the sacrament of the body of Christ daily or frequently to holy and pious lay people of both sexes, had very much to endure in public and before the eyes of all, not only from ordinary people, but also on the part of the church and the dignitaries, and that merely and solely because they invited and admonished holy-living people to frequent communion."

It is unfortunate that the acts of this synod of 1388 have never been found. They would in all probability have decided the question so frequently contested since 1433, whether or no Mathias of Janow was the first person in Bohemia who recommended communion in both kinds for the laity. The affirmative was maintained before the council of Basel, in 1433, by Magister John of Rokycan, and his opponents did not traverse his assertion, but simply replied that, if Mathias had begun to preach that innovation, or even to administer the communion in that manner himself, his doctrine, or rather practice, made no progress, for in the synod at Prague, in 1389, he was obliged to desist,

and recant his opinions. It is true that Mathias uses the terms "sacrament of the body and blood" and "sacrament of the body" of the Lord quite indifferently, as in the passage above quoted; but I have not been able to discover a particle of evidence of *practical* Utraquism in Bohemia before the custom was revived upon purely scriptural ground by Magister Jacobellus, after Hus's departure for Constance.

The recantation just alluded to is a recent discovery, and appears for the first time in print in Palacký's "Documenta," p. 699. I translate it literally in full:—

"Know all faithful people, that I, M. Mathias, have preached some things not so rightly, cautiously, and prudently as was due and convenient; whereby I either have been or might have been to some a cause or occasion of error or scandal. Therefore, to remove those things, and that the truth may not be concealed, and that the faithful may know what they ought to believe or hold in these matters—

"(1) I say, firstly, that the images of Christ and the saints do not give cause or occasion for idolatry; neither on account of abuse on the part of any one soever ought they to be burned or destroyed.

"(2) Secondly, that according to the institution and custom of Holy Mother Church, images ought to be adored and venerated to the honour of those whom they represent, and I do myself adore and venerate them and desire them to be venerated, and that it is fit and just according to me to kneel down and fasten up lighted candles before images; and that the miracles performed on those who are venerating images are piously to be believed performed by divine power; and if I have said the contrary of any of these things, I have not said

it rightly, and being now better informed, I will not hold or say it any more.

“(3) Item, as regards the saints on their way and in their fatherland” (*i.e.*, on earth and in heaven), “I hold this, and affirm that it ought to be held, that the saints in heaven, and their bodies and bones, and also other sanctified things, as the garments and ornaments of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the saints, ought to be venerated here on earth; and that the saints themselves in heaven are and can be of more avail to us by their intercession than the saints living on earth. And if any one, owing to my words, should believe the contrary of any of the things aforesaid, he would be in error, and so would any one who should lead or have led him into such an error.

“(4) Item, I affirm and believe that a man by worthily receiving the body of Christ becomes a mystical member of Christ; and that it must not be said on that account, that the hand, foot, or eye, or any member whatsoever of a man, becomes the hand, foot, or eye, or other mystical member of Christ. And if I have said anything of a tenour contrary hereto, I do not hold it, and I affirm that it ought not to be held.

“(5) Item, I affirm that people, and especially lay people, ought not to be led or exhorted to a daily communion of the Lord’s Sacrament. Item, that not every incipient penitent ought presently to be led to approach the Holy Communion. Item, that not every one ought indifferently to be admitted to daily communion of the body of Christ. And if I have done or said the contrary of any of these things, I will not do or say it for the future, but rather avoid it.”

His sentence was: “Let him be suspended from preaching and hearing confessions and administering the Eucharist, except in his own parish church, for half a year.”

Another priest, named JACOB, was at the same time suspended for ten years for “showing a fig”

(i.e. putting his thumb between his fore and middle fingers) to an image of the Virgin Mary, and expressing a wish to boil peas with such an image and others like it.

But the significance of Mathias as a precursor of Hus will not be properly apparent unless attention is directed to a few more extracts from his very remarkable writings, especially from his work "De Regulis." In the preface to this he says:—

"I have written these books from love and devotion to the blessed and super-celestial sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, if haply I might be able to advance its honour and glory, and the love of the people of modern days, and a faithful desire to venerate it more and enjoy it worthily, in such manner and to such end as it was itself prepared by Christ Jesus, and distributed and given to the beloved church of the saints of God. Neither would I under the bushel of my own laziness and carelessness conceal things which, as a diligent searcher of the Scriptures from my youth upwards, I have by and with Christ Jesus gathered from books and received from the illumination of that same most faithful crucified Jesus, who sweetly illuminateth every man that cometh into this world. Wherefore in these my writings I have throughout made most use of the Bible and its actual manuscripts, and but little of the sayings of the doctors; both because the Bible occurs to me promptly and abundantly for writing on every matter of consideration and every subject, and because out of it and through its most divine verities, which are clear and self-evident, all opinions are more solidly confirmed, are founded with greater acuteness, and are meditated on more usefully; and because it is that which I have loved from my youth up, and have named my beloved friend and spouse, yea, the mother of beauteous affection and knowledge and fear and holy hope. And as soon as I found the blessed Augustine, in his book "De Doctrina Christianâ," and Jerome, saying that the study of the texts of

the most holy Bible is in the beginning and in the end above all things necessary and useful to one desiring to attain to knowledge of theological truth, and is and ought to be the fundamental thing to every well-instructed Christian, ere long my mind became attached to the Bible in perpetual love. And here I confess that from my youth it has not departed from me, even unto age and unto old age, neither in my path nor in my home, nor when I was busy nor when I was at leisure; and in every doubt of mind, in every question, I always found in and through the Bible satisfactory and lucid explanation and consolation for my soul; and in all my trouble, persecution, and sadness, I always fled for refuge to the Bible, which, as I have said, is my dearest friend, and always walks with me. And it has always met me as an honoured mother, and as a wife married from a virgin has welcomed me, and according to the multitude of cares in my heart its consolations have rejoiced my soul. O how sweetly then, in proportion to my capacity and measure, did it feed me on every occasion with the bread of life and understanding! and dispersing the darkness in which I was fluctuating, how usefully did it give me to drink of the water of salutary wisdom! Wherefore, when I saw very many carrying always and everywhere with them the relics and bones of divers saints, I chose for myself the Bible, my chosen one, as the companion of my travel, to carry always with me, and to be ever at my side in readiness for my defence and continual consolation even in adversity."

With regard to the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches, and that in the Roman Church between the two antipopes and their followers, Mathias says:—

"Understand the proverb by those things that are seen at the present day, to wit, that the great city of the world of Christians is in fact rent into three parts—*i.e.* that of the Romans towards the south, that of the Greeks towards the east, and that of the French towards the west. Of whom the Romans say, 'Here is

the church and here is Christ ;' the French say, ' Not so ; we are the church and here is Christ ;' and the Greeks say, pertinaciously, ' Ye lie, both of you ; we are the church and here is Christ.' Lo ! to the letter is fulfilled the gospel above quoted, wherein it is said, ' In those days it shall be said unto you, Lo ! here is Christ, or lo ! there.' Lo ! the darkened condition of the sun and moon, so that even the city set upon a hill is concealed and clouded over, so that it cannot be seen ! So that out of an infinite multitude of Christians there cannot easily be found any who can be quite certain where the only true church of God is, and who can venture to show and consistently to point out to all inquirers where out of these three the church is, and where Christ is. This I do not say with regard to all ; for there are some who do know where Christ and His body are, of whom it is written, ' Wheresoever the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together.' And I believe that Christ is in that portion which has joined the Romans ; but what I say here, I speak comparatively, with regard to the whole multitude of those who were formerly called Christians. I speak also by way of comparison with the certainty of the primitive church of the saints, in which it was notorious where the church was and where Christ was. But now nowhere is there so great a certainty of the existence of Jesus Christ evident in these portions, as for any one boldly to offer himself to die for Him. Foxes therefore have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man—*i.e.* the true Christian, the son of our Lord Jesus Christ—hath not where to lay his head ; *i.e.* where to flee safely for refuge, and where to be strengthened and protected from demons and from hypocrites, but is persecuted on all sides and perplexed by sins in the present exceeding tribulation. For lo ! all are, as it were, friends of Jesus Christ in word and tongue, but in deed and in life almost all are His enemies : all are corporeally members of His household, but almost all are strangers in work and will. If thou pourest out thy soul to any one in warm feeling and words, as if wishing to find the crucified Jesus, thou wilt depart from him embittered in mind, finding in thyself that thou hast there lost the grace of

Jesus Christ, and thy toil and fine words as well. Thus neither wilt thou venture openly and solemnly to profess Christ crucified, because then thou wilt without moderation be treated as a heretic, and wilt not depart unreviled or unspat upon; and then by experience thou wilt feel this exceeding great tribulation and most bitter bitterness of all faithful bodies, consciences, and souls in Jesus."

On the subject of the images of the saints and their veneration, Mathias uses language which he was compelled to withdraw in the recantation given above. His words are, however, too striking to be omitted. They run as follows:—

"Alas! at the present day certain colleges, and a multitude of those who call themselves masters of the church and wise men, have established decrees in the church of God, to the effect that statues of wood and stone, of silver and other like materials, ought to be adored and worshipped by Christians—whereas holy Scripture saith openly and expressly, 'Thou shalt not adore them nor worship them'—a thing which can in no wise be maintained or defended by the assertion of Thomas of Aquinum and other doctors; and the holy church, although she hath allowed images and statues, and teaches that they ought to be *honoured* and *venerated*, yet hath never taught or laid it down that they are to be *adored* or *worshipped*, as is manifest in the *corpus [juris]* in the faculty of the jurists. They have decreed, moreover, that they ought to be prayed to (*deprecandæ*), which is, in the Bohemian tongue, *modliti se*, and thus have taught the people with collegiate authority that the people are to pray to images (*aby se obrazom lidé modlili*). They have decreed, moreover, and in synod (1388) commanded it to be preached to the people, that the people ought piously to believe that the virtue of God and His saints is in painted statues of stone or wood, and therefore that the miracles, which appear or are reported to be performed there, are wrought by God through and owing to these images; and therefore whoso-

ever believes this, or puts confidence in such a statue, and flees for refuge to the statue, doth in no wise ill—nay, neither ought simple people to be corrected or chidden for betaking themselves to statues in time of their need, or to relics of saints or such other dead things without merit or virtue. They have, moreover, enacted that sermons must not be preached against the abuse of statues or relics, saying that in such things it doth not come to pass that the Christian people erreth. But who will not understand how pernicious these things are to the uninstructed and carnal Christian people, if he considers that the modern lay people, not having the spirit of the Lord Jesus, can in no wise ascend mentally to spiritual things, but being merely carried away by carnal judgment and imagination, only appreciates corporal things, and gapes and fears before them, pouring itself out wholly to them?”

On the subject of Church reform, as regards superfluous rites and ceremonies, etc., the words of Mathias are so similar to those of the preface to the Common Prayer-Book of the Church of England that I cannot resist the temptation to quote one other passage at length.

“The Lord Jesus,” he says, “did not give any written law to His followers, although He might have done this in His lifetime in many ways, but merely placed His own good Spirit and the Spirit of His Father in the hearts of believers for a living and perfect law, and a generally sufficient rule of life, according to what has been proved above, and according to the Scriptures and prophets. Wherefore also His apostles, desiring not to burthen the people believing in Jesus with various doctrines, inventions, and precepts, wrote few things, commanded still fewer, and confirmed unshakably by statutes fewest of all. It is manifest in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles how the beloved fathers and apostles of Christ desired their fellow-Christians to be to a great extent free, and not tied to a multitude of precepts.

Whence it appears that those later persons have acted and still act cruelly and barbarously, who have introduced and authoritatively confirmed their numerous inventions, various doctrines, and rigid commands in the family of God and the Lord Jesus, binding and burthening their subjects overmuch, so that there is such a multiplicity and so infinite a multitude of such doctrines and inventions and commandments of men, that, as was said a little before, they have filled many books, and those very large and costly ones, which no one hardly but a rich man could procure, nor even if he devoted himself to them throughout the whole of his life, could he sufficiently read and beneficially digest them. And yet they will have it that the Christian people are bound to all those things that are therein contained, all which things, as hath been said, they are unable to perform, nay, even to learn or fully to remember. Wherefore I have concluded in my own mind, that, for the purpose of renewing peace and union in the general body of Christians, it is expedient to root out all that plantation and curtail again the word upon the earth, and bring back the church of Christ Jesus to its salutary and compendious beginnings, retaining proportionately few, and those apostolic, commandments. For, in the presence of my crucified Lord Jesus, I think that the law of the Holy Spirit and the gospel, copied and circulated, and the ordinary fathers of the lay people—as the pope, the bishops, the parsons, and their assistants—are quite sufficient for lawfully guiding the whole community of people and every individual man of the community. The above-mentioned things are, I say, sufficient for resolving every question and determining every case in the court of conscience and in the court of justice, with the addition to the aforesaid of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.”

Well might Sigismund, king of the Romans and afterwards emperor, tell the assembled fathers at Constance that the “sect,” of which Hus was then the immediate leader and exponent, was no

new thing, but had taken its origin in his own early youth ! Well, too, might Augustus Neander, fresh from the perusal of the MS. of Mathias of Janow, make the unexpected statement before the Academy of Sciences at Berlin, on August 13, 1847, that "the study of the writings of Mathias of Janow, if one goes directly from them to that of the works of Hus, shows us that already, quite independently of Wycliffe, a reaction against the hierarchy in Bohemia, proceeding immediately from the religious interest, and from sympathy with the religious wants and requirements of the people, had formed itself; a reaction which, although it still attached itself to the dominant ecclesiastical system, was yet already based upon the principle of the German Reformation, reference to Christ alone, and His Word in Holy Scripture !"

CHAPTER III.

JOHN HUS, FROM HIS BIRTH TO HIS BREACH WITH
ARCHBISHOP ZBYNEK.

JOHN of HUSINETZ, commonly called JOHN HUS, *i.e.* JOHN GOOSE, was born on July 6th, 1369, in the little town of Husinetz, in the south of Bohemia. The house in which he was born is still standing, and has been carefully restored by the subscriptions of patriotic Bohemians. His parents were poor, and it appears from a Latin letter addressed to Magister Martin, "his pupil and dearest brother in Christ," from Constance, in which he recommends not only his nephews, but also his brother to his care, bidding him "do to them as thou knowest," that he was not an only son. When he grew out of boyhood, he betook himself to the schools at Prague, where he maintained himself like other poor scholars, by chanting and performing other subordinate services in the churches. He alludes to his mode of life in several passages of his Bohemian works. In a singular passage on the

subject of wicked women, who endeavour to seduce others into sin, he says: "These are the devil's spoons, by means of which he devours others, but when he has done devouring others with the spoon, he eats the spoon also. As, when I was a poor scholar, I used to make a spoon of a piece of bread till I had done eating my pease-porridge, and then I ate the spoon." He also deplores having taken part, as a "mask," in the blasphemous ceremonies of the "Boy Bishop," and regrets the careless manner in which—the choir apparently being found by contract—he had been accustomed to chant the services. "When I," says he, "was a scholar and sang vigils along with others, we merely sang sufficient to get through the business; for others took the money and did the harrowing and ploughing through us." It was always his idea to enter into the clerical profession, though he acknowledges he had no higher thought in so doing than that of obtaining a comfortable maintenance. After passing through the inferior schools he entered the high school or university in the Faculty of Arts. When he was about twenty-four years old (1393), the celebrated jubilee or year of indulgence was proclaimed at Prague, and the student John of Husinetz performed, like others, the pilgrimages from church to church and the duty of confession at St. Peter's on the Vyssegrad. In order to obtain full absolution, he was obliged to part with the only four groschen that he possessed, and was consequently reduced to a meal of dry bread.

In the September of the same year, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and in January, 1396, that of Master of Arts. Soon afterwards he also probably took that of Bachelor in Divinity; but the first certain mention of him as a Bachelor in Divinity is not earlier than 1404. As a young magister, he must have devoted himself to lecturing in the university, or we should not find him towards the end of 1398 appointed examiner at the quarterly examination for the B.A. degree, and afterwards frequently holding other appointments in the Faculty of Arts. Becoming a prominent member of the university, he was on St. Gallus' day (Oct. 15th), 1401, elected Dean of the Faculty of Arts, for the half-year ending on St. George's day (April 22nd), 1402. He became rector of the university for the first time on April 1, 1403. There is little doubt that he was ordained priest some time in 1400, although the "*liber ordinationum*" does not contain his name. But he states himself, in answer to a charge brought against him at Constance, that he was not a priest at all in 1399, while it is certain that he was a preacher in 1401. Writing to the people of Prague in 1412, he says, that he had then laboured twelve years among them, and in the Latin treatise "On the Body and Blood of the Lord," which he composed at Constance in 1415, he states that he wrote his first treatise on the subject in the first year of his priesthood and preaching, which was, he thought, the year of the Lord 1401.

Thus far he appears to have had no higher aim or object in life, but to have lived like other magisters in the university. He took especial pleasure in the robes appertaining to the magister's degree, the so-called "tabard," the gown with "wings" or long sleeves, and the cap trimmed with crimson. Neither had he any objection to the banquets and other festive gatherings in which the magisters of the day took great delight. He was also an enthusiastic chess-player. But after his ordination to the priesthood he began to withdraw himself from the vanities of the world, and to comprehend in its fulness the high calling of his position. He applied himself especially to the duties of the pulpit, endeavouring, like his precursors, Milicz, and Mathias, to educate his hearers in the truths of Christianity, and awaken them to a life of virtue. Though he could only have had the slightest personal knowledge of either Mathias or Stitný, yet their writings must have been well known to him and must have assisted him in his preparations for the pulpit. Nor is there any doubt that he attached himself from the first to the party of those ecclesiastics who arrayed themselves against the abuses then dominant among the clergy.

The first church in which Hus performed the duties of a preacher was that of St. Michael in the old town of Prague, the incumbent of which was Bernard, a monk from the monastery of Zderaz, who was a man decidedly opposed to

reform in the Church, and is designated by Hus in one of his Latin letters as "a very great enemy of the Word of God." It would appear, however, that this difference of opinion did not prevent friendly after-dinner conversations at the parsonage, in which matters of religion and Church government were frequently discussed. Hus was also intimate with Wenceslas the cup-maker, a well-known citizen of Prague. At his house one day in 1401, the drowning of John of Pomuk and maltreatment and imprisonment of other dignitaries by King Wenceslas became the subject of conversation, and some one said that Divine service ought to have been suspended by interdict on that account. Hus vehemently opposed the idea, and demanded a reason from Scripture, why the praises of God should be discontinued on account of the death or imprisonment of himself or any other priest. He appears to have committed his sermons to writing from the first, and to have caused them to be fair copied for publication, no doubt thereby obtaining a considerable name as a preacher. Thus when the preachingship at the chapel "Bethlehem" became vacant in 1402, Hus was duly nominated under the peculiar arrangements of the foundation and presented by the patron. No doubt this took place with the goodwill and possibly through the exertions of the merchant Kriz (Cross), who was a frequent visitor at the house of Wenceslas the cup-maker, and was at that time, if not actually burgomaster, at any rate one of the alder-

men of the old town. The archbishop's confirmation of the presentation was issued on March 14th, 1402, only a few days after the arrest of King Wenceslas by his brother Sigismund, and before the expiration of the half-year, during which Hus was Dean of the Faculty of Arts.

It is singular that during the persecution of the followers of Milicz, and only a year and a half after the recantation of Mathias of Janow, men zealous for religious reform should have succeeded in founding an institution at Prague, the undoubted object of which was to work in that direction. Its principal founder was John of Milheim, a favourite courtier and confidential adviser of King Wenceslas. No place of the name of Milheim being known in Bohemia, it is probable that he was of foreign origin, and perhaps a relative of John of Milheim, who came to Bohemia as provincial prior of the Teutonic Knights. Though he was himself only a "knight," his wife Anna was of the ancient and noble family of Hasenburg. He probably died sometime between 1404 and 1408.

It is possible that the idea may have originated with the merchant Kriz, who presented a site from his own house for the erection of the chapel, and reserved to himself a considerable participation in the undertaking. Unable to carry it through by himself, he would naturally seek the aid of a more powerful friend. The foundation deed, dated May 24th, 1390, declares that it was an institution of the old fathers that the Word of God should not

be fettered, but be as free and beneficial as possible to the Church and her members, and deploras that there was as yet no locality in Prague set apart for the office of the preacher; yea, that preachers, especially those who preached in the Bohemian tongue, were for the most part compelled to go about from house to house and from secret place to secret place. John of Milheim, therefore, to make better provision for this need for the future, ordained that the incumbent of the new chapel should be a secular priest, whose duty it should be to preach in the Bohemian language in the morning and afternoon of every holy day, except in Advent and Lent, when there was only to be a morning sermon. The celebration of mass was left to the discretion of the preacher, who was strictly bound to residence, might not absent himself without the permission of the archbishop or his vicars, and must then provide a competent substitute. The endowment amounted to nine "kops" (a "kop" is sixty) of groschen, minus ten groschen, per annum, with the proviso that this might be raised to twenty kops, but not more; for a priest, who was a preacher, ought not to thirst for riches. The preacher was not allowed to appropriate the offerings or gifts collected in the chapel, which were to be kept under three keys, and used for repairs and other requirements, and after a certain time for the maintenance of poor students connected with it, at a rate of five kops each per annum. It was founded in the name of the Holy Innocents, and

the name of BETHLEHEM was given to it. John of Milheim, according to custom, reserved the patronage to himself and his heirs, but with this especial arrangement, that at each vacancy after the first appointment, the three senior magisters of the Bohemian "nation," in the late Emperor Charles's "college," were to take counsel with the burgo-master of the Old Town, and nominate three men, whom they thought best adapted for the preacher's duties, one of whom was then to be presented by himself or his heirs.

The chapel Bethlehem, and the priest's house beside it, were built before the execution of the deed of foundation. Archbishop John of Jenstein laid the first stone with his own hands, and ere long (June 27th) confirmed the foundation, which henceforth possessed the status of a regular ecclesiastical benefice. On September 2nd followed King Wenceslas's assent to the gift of the site, and on September 12th to the appropriation of fixed payments to the amount of thirty kops per annum. The town council of the Old Town, at the request of Kriz, emancipated the site from all town dues. Ninety groschen were to be paid annually to the incumbent of St. Philip and St. James, in whose parish the chapel was situated, as compensation for any loss that his receipts might suffer therefrom, a sum which in 1403 was raised to three kops.

In Milheim's foundation the right of establishing a second preachership, as well as an altar in the chapel Bethlehem, was reserved to the merchant

Kriz. This right he exercised on this wise. He first appointed a second preacher, who was to take turns with the first preacher or incumbent, and afterwards established an altar in honour of SS. Martha and Catherine and other holy virgins, appointing and endowing a special altar priest to perform an early chanted mass before every morning sermon, and daily in Advent and Lent. The altar priest was also expressly forbidden to sing masses elsewhere for money. The patronage of the second preachership and the altar was reserved by Kriz to himself and his heirs for ever.

The first preacher and incumbent of Bethlehem was John Protiva of Nováves (*New village*), who was appointed by John of Milheim himself. On his promotion in 1396, the next appointment was made in accordance with the terms of the deed, and the choice fell on Magister Stephen of Kolin, a distinguished member of the university, who was a Bachelor of Divinity and a Canon of All Saints, and had been Dean of the Faculty of Arts. He was an ardent patriot (*Zelator patriæ ferventissimus*, as Hus calls him), and a zealous church reformer. The second preacher, John of Stiekna, a Cistercian monk, was likeminded. Having somehow gained the favour of Queen Hedwiga of Poland, he was presented to a Polish benefice, and nominated one of her court chaplains, although he never ceased to perform his duties at Bethlehem. To his excellence as a preacher Hus bears witness, testifying that he was a "sounding trumpet." He kept

himself, however, within the strictest limits of obedience to authority, and many took it ill, that he said nothing against the shameful sale of indulgences in 1393, and even recommended them from the pulpit in the church on the Vyssegrad.

Ere long a foundation was also established and endowed by the merchant Kriz, with the aid of other benefactors, for the maintenance of poor students in connection with the chapel. These students lived in the priest's house, next door to the chapel, which was also inhabited by the two preachers and the altar priest. The nomination of the students appertained to the three senior Bohemian magisters, and their supervision to the Incumbent of Bethlehem. Such was the office to which Hus was now appointed, and which he continued to hold during the remainder of his life.

A great alteration had taken place in the tone and feeling of the Bohemian and German inhabitants of Prague, and in the Bohemian and German members of the university. Both Germans and Bohemians had alike sympathized with Waldhauser and Milicz in their endeavours for reform in the Church, but, as time went on, the Germans withdrew themselves more and more from the party of reform, which ere long came to consist almost entirely of Bohemians. A blasphemous parody of the mass was composed by Germans, in which it was chanted in imitation of the gospel genealogies: "Stanislas begat Peter of Znaym, Peter begat Palecz, and Palecz begat Hus." Tomek ascribes this bitterness

on the part of the Germans to the endowments and dotations, which now began to be given to the university to the exclusive advantage of the Bohemian *jazyk* or nationality, literally, "language." There were also disputes between the German and Bohemian citizens of Prague, both as regards the rights of their respective "languages," and also upon religious questions. In 1399 the rector of the "Teyn" church prohibited the singing of a favourite Bohemian hymn on the resurrection, apparently because it contained the lines: "O heav'nly King most dear, Thy Czeskish people hear!" * Complaint was made to the archbishop, and the offending priest was punished by imprisonment.

When Ruprecht, the elector palatine, was, after the deposition of Wenceslas, chosen King of the Romans, the German element in the University of Prague was by no means faithful to Wenceslas, who could also place but little reliance on the council of the Old Town, which was almost entirely composed of Germans. From patriotic feeling Hus expressed himself strongly in the pulpit against the excesses of the troops of the Margraves of Meissen, when in alliance with the lords of the league they appeared before the walls of Prague in 1401. But Hus was no common German hater, but repeats frequently in his writings, that a good German was dearer to him than his own brother, if a wicked man; although he complains of the hypocritical

* The entire hymn is given in my "Lectures on the Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century," pp. 19, 20.

manner in which Germans were wont to go before the king and swear to be faithful to him and to the country; "but never will that come to pass, till the snake basks upon the ice."

After the last citation of Mathias of Janow before the archbishop's court, and his consequent recantation, no trace of any doctrinal persecution is found for about ten years. This may be accounted for partly by the terror excited in the minds of the superior clergy by Wenceslas's cruel treatment of John of Pomuk and others, and the failure of the archbishop to obtain redress from the pope, and partly by the circumspect and tolerant character of his successor, Archbishop Olbram. But after the death of Olbram in May, 1402, the vacant see was for a year and five months in the hands of "administrators," elected by the Chapter of Prague, King Wenceslas being then in captivity, and his brother Sigismund usurping authority and ruling in his stead. Attempts were now made again to crush the reforming section of the clergy, who raised their voices against the abuses favoured and taken advantage of by the dominant party. A pretext for these proceedings was found in the doctrines of the Englishman, JOHN WYCLIFFE, who was a contemporary of the Bohemian Milicz, and who had come to the front in defence of the interests of his country against the drain of money out of it through the rapacity of the papal see. This man had not only raised his voice against ecclesiastical abuses and in favour of a better religious education

of the people, but had also taken upon himself to criticize various doctrines of the Church, as inconsistent with the veritable teaching of Christ. As early as 1377, he had drawn upon himself the wrath of Pope Gregory XI., and in 1382, twenty-four articles alleged to be held and promulgated by him and his adherents were condemned by a council convoked at London by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Powerful protection, however, especially that of John of Gaunt, "time honour'd Lancaster," preserved him from personal persecution till his death in 1385. It was some time before his works reached Bohemia and attracted the attention of men, whose hearts beat in sympathy with his. There is not the slightest trace of acquaintance with Wycliffe in the works of Magister Mathias of Janow. But soon after Wycliffe's death, disputes began among certain magisters in the University of Prague respecting some of his views, especially with regard to the sacrament of the altar. Stitný himself began in the seventieth year of his age to incline to the belief, that the substance of bread and wine remained after consecration, though in his last work, written in 1400, he rejected this view, and accepted the current doctrine of the Church. But the knowledge of Wycliffe's works was still very incomplete in Bohemia, and according to Hus's own statement, it was his philosophical works that were principally in use in and about the year 1403, while his more important theological writings were not generally known.

John Hubner, a Silesian of German nationality, whether on his own account or by order of the administrators of the archdiocese, examined the books of Wycliffe and extracted therefrom twenty-one articles, which, along with the twenty-four condemned by the London synod, were taken into consideration by the Chapter of Prague, and all forty-five articles were laid before the university. The Rector, Walter Harraser, Hus's immediate successor in the office, convoked an assembly of the magisters on May 28th, 1403. After the articles had been read, a great variety of opinion displayed itself. Many considered that the selected passages bore a different sense in extract from what they had in connexion with their context. Magister Nicholas of Litomysl told Hubner to his face: "Thou hast falsely, unrighteously, and mendaciously extracted articles from books, which stand not thus;" and Magister John Hus added, that "such adulterators of books were more deserving of being burnt than Berlin and Wlaska, the adulterators of saffron," who had not long previously been burnt alive at Prague. Stephen Palecz threw a copy of a book of Wycliffe's on the table, and said to the assembled magisters: "Let who will stand up and speak against a single word in this book: I will defend it." Magister Stanislas of Znaym undertook to prove, that not one of the forty-five articles was heretical or erroneous; at which some of the elder magisters took such offence, that they quitted the assembly. However, the majority declared in

favour of the views of the chapter, and a resolution was passed, that no one was to teach or maintain the articles aforesaid, either in public or in private.

But before the year was out, a new Archbishop, Zbynek Zajitz of Hasenburg, was elected and entered into possession of the see. He was a man still young and of business-like habits, but possessed more goodwill than learning and knowledge; nay, it was even asserted that he learned the alphabet after his elevation to the archbishopric. He was, however, a skilful and experienced general, and very successful in the military undertakings entrusted to him by King Wenceslas, after his escape from Vienna. Neglecting theoretical disputes in theology, he turned his attention to the practical reform of abuses, and soon after entering upon the duties of his see, commissioned Hus to make known to him, either personally or by letter, any defect that he saw in ecclesiastical arrangements. It is easy hence to see, that the party of reform must have attained great weight and importance, and that Hus, the well-known preacher of Bethlehem, must have begun to be considered as its leader.

Neither did Hus neglect the commission thus given him by the archbishop, but drew his attention amongst other things to the deceptions practised in the exhibition of false relics, in the announcement of false miracles, and in thus extracting money by way of gifts and offerings from the pockets of the laity. Several places in Bohemia were frequented by pilgrims, but there was one in the Margravate

of Brandenburg, Wilsnak near Wittemberg, which had for some time possessed especial celebrity. Here was exhibited what was alleged to be the natural blood of Christ, which of course was represented as possessing miraculous powers. Hus and two other magisters were commissioned by the archbishop to examine into the matter, and it was soon shown that the whole thing was a deception. A lad was said to have had a miracle of healing performed upon his foot; it was proved that his foot was worse than before. Two blind men were asserted to have regained their sight; they admitted before the three commissioners, the public notary and other witnesses, that they had never been blind at all, but had merely been afflicted with a painful affection of the eyes. A citizen of Prague, then lately deceased, Peter of Cachy, had made a pilgrimage to Wilsnak, and there offered a silver hand. It was proved by the evidence of his friends and household, that he had received no benefit whatever, but that, wishing to know what the priests would say about the aforesaid hand, he had remained in the place till the third day. The priest in his presence exhibited the silver hand in the pulpit, and said, "Children! hear the miracle! A citizen of Prague has had his hand healed by the sacred blood; and in witness thereof has offered this silver hand." Peter rose up and showed his hand, saying, "Priest, why liest thou? See! my hand is affected as it was before." On account of such scandals, the archbishop in synod, in 1406,

forbade further pilgrimages to Wilsnak, under pain of excommunication, and took similar measures with regard to similar places in Bohemia. Hus wrote a Latin treatise on the subject, in which he distinctly denied the existence anywhere of the natural blood of Christ, the whiskers of Christ, the milk of the Virgin Mary, and other relics of the kind ; and also warned people against lightly crediting miracles of recent date.

Archbishop Zbynek also made use of the services of Hus and others of the same tendency, as preachers before the synods, which he held from time to time in his diocese. At the synod held on St. Vitus's Day, 1405, Stanislas of Znaym, and at that on October 23rd, John Hus, were the preachers. In both sermons vivid and truthful descriptions were given of the life of the clergy of the day, and of the abuses dominant therein, nor was any grade or rank left unnoticed. Archdeacons, deans, dignitaries, canons, had their unrighteousnesses laid before their eyes just as plainly as ordinary parsons and altar priests ; and monks were criticized as freely as secular clergy. Stanislas did not hesitate to suggest to the archbishop, that it was his duty to exert himself to the utmost of his power to extirpate all evil and punish those who would not correct themselves. Hus included within the scope of his criticisms, not only bishops and archbishops, but also the pope and the cardinals. The archbishop was present in person at Hus's sermon, as well as numerous ecclesiastical dignitaries, and a

larger number of clergy than had been seen together assembled for many years. As soon as the sermon was ended, Adam of Nezetitz, the vicar-general, ascended the pulpit, eulogized Hus's discourse, and addressed the clergy to the same effect. Hus also delivered a copy of his sermon to the archbishop.

There were also other occasions on which the preaching powers of Hus and his friends were in request. At the annual commemoration of the Emperor Charles IV. as founder of the university, on December 5th, 1404, Hus was selected to address the clergy in the church of St. Gallus. But his principal and regular working station was the chapel Bethlehem. Thousands of hearers crowded thither, as they had crowded formerly to hear the addresses of Milicz, eager to receive the Word of God from his eloquent lips. And there it was that he gained the favour and goodwill, not only of the populace, but also of many influential citizens of Prague and persons of importance at King Wenceslas's court. Many of the clergy also attended his preaching for instruction and improvement; and many asked his counsel in various questions arising in the course of their spiritual duties, of which Hus required a more conscientious performance than was in accordance with the perverted usage of the day. It was beyond all question Hus's preaching at Bethlehem, that so attracted and influenced Queen Sophia, that she nominated him her chaplain, and, as is supposed, also made him her confessor.

Over and above his duties as a preacher, Hus never ceased working in the university, where he lectured, examined, and took part in the government of his faculty, and in the care of the interests of the Bohemian "nation." Engagements of this kind probably took up a great part of his time, and caused him to be less fertile as a writer. Besides his written sermons in the Latin tongue, the above-mentioned treatise on the natural Blood of Christ, and another on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which he composed in 1401, there is no Latin or Bohemian work of his, which we can be sure was written before 1412.

Both as a pastor and as a teacher, Hus began in course of time to draw from the fountain of John Wycliffe. He saw in Wycliffe's writings the same energetic zeal for reform in the Church that he felt himself, and in which he was encouraged by the example of his worthy precursors in his own country. So convinced was he of the excellence of Wycliffe's work and writings, that once in the presence of the archbishop he is said to have exclaimed, that he hoped his soul would be where that of Magister John Wycliffe was. In this favourable judgment of Wycliffe, he and his friends were greatly confirmed by a document dated October 5th, 1406, under the seal, and issued in the name of the University of Oxford, which had been procured by some of Wycliffe's disciples there, and which bore testimony to his virtuous life and orthodoxy, expressly refuting the stories that he had been

condemned for heresy, and that his body had been given to the flames after his death. This document was brought from Oxford to Prague by two students, one of whom, Nicholas Faulfisch, also brought with him a piece of stone from Wycliffe's tomb at Lutterworth. The decree of the University of Prague, in 1403, prohibiting the enunciation of certain articles extracted from the writings of Wycliffe, did not hinder their being read or their ever increasing circulation in Bohemia.

But however great was the value set by Hus upon Wycliffe as a Christian teacher, an "Evangelical Doctor," or as the "Doctor of deep thoughts," as he terms him in his Bohemian writings, yet he was no blind follower of his teaching. Selecting from his books whatever he thought to be true and useful, he endeavoured withal, like Mathias of Janow and Thomas of Stitný, to remain at one with the doctrines of the Catholic Church. The opinion of Wycliffe, that the substance of bread and wine remained in the sacrament of the altar after consecration, was never at any time maintained or defended, but was always expressly and definitively rejected by Hus. Like Mathias of Janow, Hus ascribed the highest value and weight to Holy Scripture, as the most certain and infallible rule of Christian doctrine; but he did not reject to the same extent as Wycliffe the traditions of the Church and the teaching of the fathers, but acknowledged that Holy Scripture ought to be explained in accordance with them. Neither did Hus agree with

Mathias of Janow in every respect, expressing himself on many points with much greater moderation. For instance, the honour paid to images and to holy relics was never so sharply condemned by Hus as by Mathias, nor did Hus coincide with him and with Wycliffe in their absolute condemnation of monastic orders.

It was never Hus's aim to discover novelties in Christian doctrine, but rather by Christian teaching to educate the people, and thus to engraft correct conceptions of it in them. For that purpose it was requisite to eradicate erroneous notions, which had never been in accordance with the teaching of the Church, but in which the depraved and degraded clergy had been only too glad to leave and encourage the laity. Hence it was that Hus found abundance to do at first as a preacher and afterwards as a writer. In Hus's time the priests were in the habit of boasting of their superiority to the Virgin Mary, because she only once conceived and bore the Saviour, whereas every priest both could and did create Him daily. Hus treated all such sayings as silly blasphemies. The priests boasted that at their will they forgave and retained men's sins, and that thus they sent whom they would to heaven and whom they would to hell. But Hus taught that the priest did not himself remit sins, but that God remitted them by the agency of the priest, even if an unworthy one; yea, that circumstances might occur under which remission might be had even without priestly absolution. The

priests took payment for hearing confessions, and granted absolution on easier terms for money. But Hus warned the people that absolution was not valid, without honest sorrow for sin, without the intention of amendment of life, and without making proper satisfaction. The priests raised no objection against, but rather encouraged the people in, excessive reliance on purchased prayers and masses, on the intercession of saints, on pilgrimages to miraculous localities, and on gifts to ecclesiastical foundations, as means of obtaining salvation. But Hus warned his hearers against such notions, and admonished them that salvation was not to be had without loving God above everything and one's neighbour as one's self.

"Robbers and usurers," said he, "and other wicked acquirers of wealth, do greatly deceive themselves in thinking to please God by getting much wickedly and giving a little to the poor, or by endowing altars and chaplains." "He who gives a single halfpenny for God's service, while alive and well, profits his soul more than if, after death, he were to give as much gold as would reach from earth to heaven." "He who endures one contrary word profits his soul more than if he were to break as many rods on his back as could grow in the largest forest." "He who humbles himself to the meanest man profits his soul more than if he were to go on pilgrimages from one end of the world to the other." "He who sheds one tear for his sins profits his soul more than if, after death, he were to weep till two rivers flowed from his eyes." "He who holds the Lord God dearer than all the creation profits his soul more than if the Mother of God with all the saints were to intercede for him."

Such expressions exhibit to the full the working of Hus amongst and upon his countrymen. And

he taught not only by word but by example. Not that he devoted himself with the self-abnegation of Milicz to the direct performance of works of Christian charity, but that his private life was such that his greatest enemies and adversaries were never able to discover anything to cast in his teeth. While urging others to a life of morality, he avoided himself the slightest approach to immorality, which was the great scandal of the day amongst the clergy; and while blaming others for their thirst for promotion and preferment, he remained content with the scanty income obtained from the endowment of Bethlehem and his occupations in the university.

But these qualities gained little recognition among the dominant class of the clergy of the day, but were looked upon in Hus with the same aversion with which they had formerly been looked upon in Milicz. Thus the favour which Hus enjoyed with the archbishop, and the archbishop's goodwill towards himself and his work, were a thorn in the flesh to the clergy of the opposite party, and they accordingly sought to undermine one who was a living and perpetual reproof to them. They found the wished-for opportunity in the delight with which Hus and his party studied the works of Wycliffe. As the archbishop himself paid little attention to their hints, the matter was taken up in an underhand manner by some of the dignitaries connected with the cathedral, and information was sent to the papal curia, that the

Wycliffite heresy was being disseminated in Bohemia. Thus, as early as June 24th, 1405, Pope Innocent VII. issued a bull to the Archbishop of Prague, in which he exhorted him to be diligent in extirpating those errors. This bull produced no immediate effect, and the kindly feeling of the archbishop towards Hus remained unaltered. But all Hus's friends, who studied the works of Wycliffe, were not so careful and circumspect in their acceptance of his sentiments as himself. In particular Stanislas of Znaym and Stephen Palecz took up some of the opinions of Wycliffe, which had been expressly condemned. Stanislas was not satisfied with maintaining in private conversations that the substance of bread remained in the sacrament of the altar after consecration, but endeavoured to induce Hus to embrace the same view, and composed a treatise in which he indirectly defended Wycliffe's doctrine. This treatise he read aloud in his room in the Carolinum on February 9th, 1406, at which Hus's co-preacher at Bethlehem, John Stiekna, took offence and laid an information against it as erroneous, in the archbishop's court. Stanislas at first thought little of this, and declared that Stiekna would soon be obliged to ask his pardon on bended knee; but the archbishop, no doubt fearing to fall into discredit at Rome, issued a citation against Stanislas, who helped himself out of the difficulty by stating on oath that his treatise was still unfinished.

This was probably the reason why, at the synod

in 1406, the archbishop issued an order, strictly enjoining it to be taught, that the substance of bread did not remain in the host after consecration, but only the true Body of Christ; nor the substance of wine after the consecration of the chalice, but only the Blood of Christ. Whoever taught or argued otherwise was under pain of excommunication to be presented to the archbishop for punishment as a heretic. In the course of 1407 several persons, both clerical and lay, were cited and questioned on these points, but all gave answers more or less satisfactory, and were released. And we may infer that the good understanding between Hus and the archbishop had not suffered thereby, from the fact that Hus was the preacher at the synod held on October 18th, 1407.

But soon afterwards a change appears to have taken place. No doubt the thoughtlessness of some of Hus's friends and partizans enabled his enemies to bring him under a superficial suspicion of heresy with the archbishop, whose scanty theological knowledge did not enable him to form an independent judgment. The archbishop had also been again cited by the papal curia under the new pope at Rome, Gregory XII., to whom it had been represented, that there were sectaries in Bohemia who entertained Wycliffite views of the sacrament of the altar; nay, that King Wenceslas himself was protecting certain of them in their errors contrary to ecclesiastical law. This incensed the king, who did not choose to put up with any such evil report,

and demanded that a searching investigation should take place for the purpose of clearing his kingdom from the charge. He also expressed his firm resolution to punish even with burning to death any who should be really convicted of heresy. Thus in 1408 several persons were cited before the archbishop's court on the charge of holding Wycliffe's forbidden doctrines.

There is some ground for inferring, that the chapel Bethlehem was now made a special object of attack by Hus's enemies. At any rate, after sixteen years had elapsed since its foundation, the merchant Kriz, as its only surviving founder, presented a petition at Rome, praying, that for the greater encouragement of pious people who entertained a special affection for it and visited it in great numbers, its foundation might also receive papal confirmation. No doubt it required protection against the unfriendly feeling of the archbishop's court, from which it had as yet received its only confirmation. And in fact Kriz did obtain from the pope a bull of very laudatory tenour respecting the special dedication of the chapel to the preaching of the Word of God in the Bohemian language, in which the pope commissioned Archbishop Zbynek, if the fact were as the petitioner asserted, to confirm the foundation with apostolic authority. This bull unfortunately arrived at Prague just when the archbishop's court was proceeding with increased severity against people suspected of Wycliffism, and when the archbishop

was already beginning to be prejudiced against the entire tendency of Hus and his adherents. Thus the foundation of the chapel never received the desired confirmation.

Mathias of Knin, apparently a pupil of Stanislas of Znaym, who presented him for his magister's degree in 1404, was one of those accused of Wycliffism. Although the offence had not been definitively proved against him, yet he was cast into the archbishop's prison and ordered to recant the doctrine of Wycliffe as to the sacrament of the altar, and to purge himself by the testimony of four witnesses. On May 14th, 1408, the archbishop sat in judgment in his palace in the Kleinseite in a large assembly of magisters, doctors and others. The accused at first defended himself, asking what could be the meaning of the recantation of error or heresy on the part of an unconvicted person? But the general vicar, John Kbel,^r said to him: "Thou must recant heresy, even though thou hast never held it." And finally the archbishop addressed the prisoner himself with military brevity in the words: "Cease talking, magister! thou wilt either recant or stay here in my prison." After this Mathias took the oath of abjuration, and purged himself by means of the four witnesses as required.

Six days afterwards, on May 20th, a meeting of the Bohemian "nation" in the university was held, no doubt at the instance of King Wenceslas and Archbishop Zbynek, who wanted to know its opinion respecting the forty-five articles extracted from the

books of Wycliffe, which had five years previously been condemned by the whole university. At this meeting seventy-four magisters took part in the proceedings, and the audience consisted of one hundred and fifty bachelors and about one thousand Bohemian students. It was unanimously resolved that the said articles were not to be held or defended by any member of the Bohemian "nation" "in their heretical, erroneous or offensive sense," under penalty of expulsion. It was also resolved, that the perusal of Wycliffe's "Dialogus" and "Trialogus," and of his treatise on the sacrament of the altar, should be prohibited to students who had not taken a degree. Hus was present and voted for the above resolutions, neither did any of his friends in anywise oppose them. The addition of the words, "in their heretical, erroneous or offensive sense," satisfied the consciences of those, who failed to find in Wycliffe's books the meaning assigned to them by their censors.

These resolutions were communicated to the archbishop, but did not suffice to revive in him his former favourable feelings towards the party of reform. Its enemies began now to make other charges against it than that of holding erroneous doctrines. They complained of the mischievous nature and evil effect of sermons preached at Prague or elsewhere in the diocese, in which the life and conversation of "prelates," *i.e.* ecclesiastical dignitaries, and other ecclesiastics were censured. This also was ascribed to Wycliffite teaching.

For this reason, at the special summer synod of the year (June 29th, 1408), [the archbishop not only caused the previous decree respecting the doctrine required to be taught as regards the sacrament of the altar to be proclaimed anew, but also prohibited any condemnatory remarks to be made on the clergy in sermons addressed to the laity. He at the same time issued an order, that all doctors, magisters, bachelors, students, priests, or others, possessing copies of Wycliffe's works, were to deposit them in the treasurer's office in the episcopal palace by St. Procop's day in that year, to be examined. The singing of divers new hymns in churches was also prohibited.

Very soon afterwards two priests were inhibited from preaching in Prague without having any special appointment. One of these, Nicholas of Velenovitz, surnamed Abraham, on being cited by the vicar general and told that he had no right to preach without the archbishop's licence, appealed to his vocation as a priest, and went so far as to assert, that not only priests, but even laymen were permitted to proclaim the gospel. The vicar general exclaimed, that this was an heretical opinion, and imprisoned him, with a view to a fresh hearing by the inquisitors, Jaroslaw, Bishop of Sarepta, a Minorite, and the Dominican Maurice Rvaczka, a Professor of Theology. Abraham was, according to custom, required before his hearing to make oath to speak the truth; he was willing enough to swear by the living God, but scrupled at swearing on the

gospels and the crucifix. Hus entered just at this moment, intending to be a spectator of the trial, and interceded for Abraham, appealing to a statement of Chrysostom's, that it was a greater matter to swear by God than by a creature. John Kbel, the vicar general, immediately interrupted him, saying: "Ha, magister! thou art here to hear, not to interfere."

Hus took occasion from this to write a letter to Archbishop Zbynek, in which he appealed to his former commission to make known to the archbishop defects in the government of the Church, and represented to him that it was not right thus to persecute meek priests, diligent in the discharge of their duties, who did not go after covetousness, but worked gratuitously in preaching the Word of God, while the licentious and ill-conducted walked at liberty and gave themselves haughty airs with impunity. He did not, he said, ascribe this to the archbishop himself, but to the malignity of others, meaning thereby the then officials of the consistory court. This letter produced no effect, and the archbishop remained under the influence of his anti-reforming advisers. Still, as the investigations hitherto made had not convicted any one of obstinate maintenance of heresy, the archbishop caused it to be solemnly announced at an extraordinary synod on July 17th, that by the permission and at the desire of King Wenceslas he had made careful inquiry in Prague and in the diocese and province of Prague, but had not found and could not find any

heterodox person or heretic. Nevertheless he persisted in his edict as to giving up the copies of the books of Wycliffe, and in confirming the decrees of the previous synod, which were aimed at preachers of Hus's tendency. His intention was to cause all Wycliffe's works, in which errors were discovered, to be burnt, and he therefore sent word of the state of matters in Bohemia to Pope Gregory XII., requesting special authorization for the purpose.

The archbishop's orders naturally produced an unfavourable feeling towards him in the minds of the reforming section of the clergy; still they almost all obeyed and gave up their copies of Wycliffe's books. Hus did so himself, paying a personal visit to the archbishop, and after giving up his books, requesting him to note aught erroneous that he found in them, and promising to draw public attention to the error. Five students alone determined to take up an attitude of resistance, and not only refused to give up their copies, but also ventured to appeal to the pope. They complained of the order to give up the books as a violation of the rights and liberties of the university, and accused the archbishop's edict, as to the doctrine to be taught respecting the sacrament of the altar, of error and even of heresy, arguing that its express tenour, that after consecration nothing remained in the host but the Body of Christ, and nothing in the chalice but the Blood of Christ, was incorrect, since, according to the doctrine of the Church, both the Body and Blood of Christ were in each kind. More-

over, on August 5th, placards were posted early in the morning, condemnatory of the archbishop and canons, and also of certain Bohemian magisters, who had not been in accord with the rest.

A friend of Hus's, Magister Marek of Hradetz, one of the three professors of the Faculty of Arts and a Canon of Prague, went to Rome as legal representative of the appealing students. After some time he was excommunicated by Archbishop Zbynek, and deprived of his stall in the cathedral, yet was not thereby deterred from sympathizing with the party of Hus. Nor was it any advantage to Hus that he had personally taken no part in the demonstrations against the archbishop. Emboldened by the archbishop's prohibition of preaching respecting the state of the clergy, Hus's adversaries filed a formal complaint against him in the name of the clergy of the city and diocese of Prague, accusing him generally of preaching mischievous sermons, whereby the people were rendered more antagonistic to the priesthood than heretofore, and in particular bringing two matters against him from a sermon preached a year previously, on July 17th, 1407, and therefore before the last year's synod, at which he had been appointed preacher by the archbishop himself. One was, that he had made mention in the sermon of Canon Peter of Vseroby, then deceased, who had been a mighty pluralist, holding four canonries and an archdeaconry by special favour of the pope. In urging the people to pray for his soul, Hus had warned the numerous clergy

present against avaricious thirsting for benefices, and declared that he would not accept the whole world on condition of dying in possession of such and so many preferments. The other was, that he had laid down the position, that it was simony, and therefore heresy, in a priest to require aught from the people, especially from the poor, for the administration of the sacraments, or for performance of the burial service ; for in that case—argued the complainants—every incumbent must be a heretic. Never was a more irrefragable proof of the decline of respect for ecclesiastical law among the mass of the clergy. For the statement which the framers of the plaint brought as a serious charge against Hus was a mere repetition of the tenour of Article 65 of the provincial statutes of Archbishop Arnost, who died in 1364 !

CHAPTER IV.

SECESSION OF THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY. CONTEST BETWEEN THE KING AND THE ARCHBISHOP.

BOTH popes—Gregory XII., the Pope at Rome, and Benedict XIII., the Pope at Avignon—were now forsaken by their cardinals, who united into one college, and in June, 1408, convoked a general council to meet at Pisa, on March 25th in the following year. They entreated all kings and princes, especially King Wenceslas of Bohemia, to aid them in their endeavours to end the great schism, and reform the Church in head and members, begging them, until a final decision should be come to by the council, to observe a strict neutrality between the rival claimants of the popedom. Wenceslas was travelling in Lusatia and Silesia, some time in September, when the letter of the cardinals reached him. He summoned the Silesian princes and other prominent laymen and clerics to meet him for consultation in November at Breslau,

and on the 24th of that month replied to the cardinals, that it was his intention to act in accordance with their request, and to send his ambassadors to the council, provided that they recognized him as the rightful King of the Romans, and engaged to treat his ambassadors accordingly. For further negotiation he accredited to them Magister John "Cardinal" of Reinstein, a friend of Hus, by whom he had been presented for the degree of M.A. in 1404. It would seem that Wenceslas also consulted the principal Bohemian magisters in the University of Prague respecting this matter, and that the proceedings of the cardinals met with their decided approval; but the date of his so doing is not ascertained. No doubt it must have caused joy and enthusiasm in their hearts, when the long-desired reform in the Church was publicly made the end and object of a general council. But for that very reason the adversaries of reform, dreading the loss of their gainful simoniacal practices and voluptuous mode of life, rose up in opposition, and led Archbishop Zbynek into resistance to the views of King Wenceslas, as soon as the question of the adhesion of the Bohemian clergy to the neutrality requested by the cardinals came upon the *tapis*.

Shortly after St. Gallus's day (October 15th), 1408, two friends of Hus, Stanislas of Znaym and Stephen of Palecz, preceded Magister John Cardinal to Italy with a commission of some kind from the king. By orders of the legate, Cardinal Balthazar

Cossa, they were arrested at Bologna, their property taken from them, and themselves cast into prison as suspected heretics. This was doubtless the result of the intrigues of their enemies at home, the legate, in hopes of future elevation, being a staunch supporter of the united cardinals, and thus having no special reason for unfavourable feeling towards Bohemians. Stanislas had already been entangled with the archbishop's court on account of his treatise on the sacrament of the altar, and this was the principal charge brought against him at Bologna. On hearing of their imprisonment, Hus and others exerted themselves in their favour, and a formal letter was sent by the university under the seal of the rector, on December 5th, to the cardinals at Pisa, petitioning for their liberation.

Not long afterwards King Wenceslas quitted Breslau and came to Kuttenberg. He had required the university to express its opinion as to the question of neutrality between the rival popes, in order to get over the difficulties raised by the archbishop in that respect. In the meeting convoked for the purpose, the magisters of the Bohemian "nation" delivered their opinions in entire accordance with the king's wishes, while the other three "nations" opposed them. The three "nations" were undoubtedly in the majority, but the rector, Henning of Baltenhagen, did not venture on direct contradiction to the king's will, and the meeting dispersed without coming to any definite conclusion. The Bohe-

mian magisters adhered to their opinion, and Hus in particular exerted himself personally with the nobles and others in high station, as well as by sermons addressed to both clergy and laity, to procure general acceptance of neutrality between the popes in the interest of the unity of the Church, without, however, asking for further renunciation of obedience to Gregory XII., than so far as concerned his dispute with the rival pope. But Archbishop Zbynek saw in this an offence against obedience to the Church, and punished it by suspending Hus and all magisters of the university, who had expressed themselves in favour of neutrality, from the performance of all priestly duties in his diocese. Hus wrote a letter to the archbishop on the subject, explaining his views on the question, but it is not known with what result.

Meanwhile the variance between the "nations" in the university became more pronounced, the Bohemian "nation," as it ripened more and more to self-consciousness, feeling the predominance of the other three "nations" an intolerable grievance. To understand the situation fully we must recur to the foundation of the university. The aims of the Emperor Charles IV. in founding the University of Prague by a "golden bull," in 1348, were rather dynastic and imperial than national and patriotic. As Paris was the great university of the *Langues d'oc et d'oïl*, so did Charles design that Prague should become the great university of the German empire, and of all nations lying on its borders, which might

some day be incorporated with it. He therefore divided it into four "nations," in all but one of which the German element became practically dominant, owing to the large and populous German towns, like Breslau, in districts otherwise Slavonic. These "nations," each of whom had an equal voice, were (1) the Bohemian, including the Moravians, Hungarians, and South Slavonians; (2) the Bavarian, including the Austrians, Swabians, Franconians, and Rhinelanders; (3) The Polish, including the Silesians, Lithuanians, and Russians; and (4) the Saxons, containing the people of Meissen, of Thuringia, of Upper and Lower Saxony, the Danes and the Swedes. This arrangement was successful enough, so long as Prague was the capital and the King of Bohemia the head of the German empire, but it was manifestly unsuited to the state of things that arose after the deposition of Wenceslas in 1400. The foundation of the University of Cracow in Poland in the same year had also a disastrous effect upon that of Prague, reducing, as it did, the Polish "nation" there almost entirely to Germans from Silesia, Prussia, and Pomerania, so that the Bohemian "nation" had now to contend against what had practically become three thoroughly Teutonic bodies.

The accounts we have of the proceedings that took place are extremely fragmentary, and we do not know who it was that originated the idea of upsetting the hitherto existing relations and placing preponderating power in the hands of natives.

Thus much, however, is certain, that among the Bohemian magisters Hus came prominently forward in the matter, and that the principal "favourites" of King Wenceslas exerted themselves to carry it through, probably considering it the most convenient mode of fulfilling the king's wish to obtain the approval of the university for the position of neutrality between the rival popes. In understanding with the "favourites," Hus sought first of all to secure unanimity on the point in the Bohemian "nation" itself, whatever might be the views of its members in other respects. In particular he conferred with Magister Andrew of Brod, and asked him seriously whether he considered the measure a righteous one. Andrew gave a decided assent and inquired of Hus in turn, whether any liberator was to be found for them. Hus replied: "I hope we shall have a liberator," meaning probably Nicholas of Prague, one of the king's privy councillors and chief secretary of the king's revenues at Kuttenberg, to whom the eventual fulfilment of the wishes of the Bohemian magisters was mainly due. It is pretty clear that, after private conferences of this nature, a resolution was come to by the entire body of the Bohemian "nation" to address a petition to the king to the above effect; and also that the German magisters took counsel together to bring the plans of the Bohemians to nought.

Very early in 1409, an embassy from the King of France came to King Wenceslas at Kuttenberg, charged with the duty of negotiating with him respect-

ing the proposed renunciation of obedience to both popes. Wenceslas summoned the rector of the university and the principal magisters of all four "nations" to consultation on this important subject. Amongst these were the Professors of Theology, John Elias and Andrew of Brod, and also John Hus and his younger friend Jerome of Prague. It would seem that the French ambassadors laid their case before the king in presence of the magisters, whose opinion was then requested by his majesty. It was now no longer possible to conceal the difference of opinion among them. The Bohemian magisters approved, while the Germans opposed, the French proposal. It is not known whether it was before or after this, that the question of the alteration in the constitution of the university, so earnestly desired by the Bohemian "nation," was first taken into consideration. On this occasion the German magisters first entreated the king to protect them in their ancient rights and privileges, which Wenceslas promised to do. Then, and not till then, did the Bohemian magisters prefer their request, which the king listened to in angry mood. Turning, it is said, to Hus, he said to him angrily, that he and his associate Jerome were continually creating disturbances; if those whose duty it was did not look to this, he would himself cause a fire to be kindled for them. But ere long, through the intervention of the king's councillors, matters took a different turn, and Wenceslas fulfilled the desire of the Bohemian magisters in overflowing measure. A

royal decree, dated Kuttenberg, January 19th, 1409, was issued to the rector and the whole society of the University of Prague, in which it was declared iniquitous and highly improper, that the German "nation," possessing no native rights in the land of Bohemia, should claim three votes in all proceedings of the university, while the Bohemian "nation," the rightful inheritor of the land, had hitherto possessed only one; wherefore the king ordained, that henceforth the Bohemian "nation" should enjoy three votes in all consultations, trials, examinations, elections, and all other acts and proceedings whatsoever, even as the French nation in the University of Paris, and other nations in Lombardy and Italy in their several universities.

Hus received by a trusty hand a copy of the king's letter before any one else. He had meanwhile fallen seriously ill—some say from chagrin at the reception he had met with from the king—and the two professors, John Elias and Andrew of Brod, came to visit him. Hus again put to them the question whether they deemed it just that the Bohemian nation should possess three votes in the University of Prague? "God grant it," said they, "but we shall never obtain it." Then he showed them the copy of the royal letter, the contents of which filled their hearts with unexpected comfort. Hus had at that time little expectation of recovery, and exhorted them, should he be called away, to exert themselves for the sake of justice and for the liberation of their nation.

Four days after the issue of this decree a royal edict was also issued (January 22nd), from Kuttenberg, wherein all persons, especially spiritual persons, of whatever office or dignity, were prohibited from either receiving or keeping in their possession any documents from Pope Gregory relating either to rights or favours, or from making any payments to him, until the unity of the Church was renewed; and all royal officials, and also the magistrates of cities, towns and villages, were commanded to arrest and bring before the king every one who disobeyed this ordinance. Wenceslas then returned to Prague, and on February 16th, concluded a solemn agreement with Cardinal Landulf, the legate commissioned by both colleges of cardinals, in which he engaged to assist them in their undertaking with all his power, to send his ambassadors to the council to be held at Pisa, and in every way to prevent obedience being paid in any of his crown lands to Gregory XII. until the final decision of the council. In return Cardinal Landulf engaged, in the name of the united cardinals, that the council would look to Wenceslas as the only true King of the Romans, and in particular would assist him with all its power for the humiliation of his rival in the empire, the Elector Palatine, Ruprecht. On March 4th, the king nominated an embassy, which was to represent him with plenipotentiary powers at the council, and aid it in every way. At the head of this was Wenceslas, Patriarch of Antioch, and

amongst its subordinate members was a privy councillor, Dr. John Naz (Nasus), a Doctor of Law and Canon of Prague, of whom we shall hear more hereafter.

Meanwhile the royal decree respecting the three votes had been publicly proclaimed in an assembly of all four "nations" in the university on January 26th. The members of the three German "nations" were naturally exasperated at its tenour, and resolved not to rest contented under it. They entered into an engagement together, rather to emigrate from Prague than submit to the new order of things, and bound themselves by an oath so to do, and never more to return to the University of Prague, under the fourfold penalty of the guilt of perjury, excommunication, loss of honour, and a fine of 100 kops of groschen, but with the proviso, that all exertions should be used both with the king and with other persons of importance to obtain the revocation of the decree. To this end they presented, on February 6th, a written petition to King Wenceslas, praying him to maintain them in the ancient system, which they could not surrender with honour, and representing to him that the arrangement by which three votes were given to the Bohemian "nation" was extremely grievous, yea, intolerable to them, and that, if it remained in force and validity, its result would be the extermination of their "nations" and the ruin of the whole university. If, however, the Bohemian "nation" considered it a detriment to itself that

each of the three "nations" should be equal to it as heretofore, they prayed the king to separate the Bohemian "nation" from the rest, and asked that the Bohemians might have a council and tribunals of their own, and their own examinations and elections, as also the other three "nations." In consequence of this further negotiations began between the parties at the king's court, on account of which both Bohemian and German magisters journeyed to the king at Zbrak and Toczniak, whither he had gone from Prague in April. The Germans rested their claims mainly upon old custom and the long observed statutes of the university, even accusing the Bohemian magisters of perjury, on the ground that every member of the university was required to swear to the observance of the statutes. The Bohemians, on the other hand, appealed to the king's inherent power of altering the statutes as much as any other laws in the land; to the natural right of Bohemians to have precedence in their own country, as the Germans had in their own Universities of Vienna and Heidelberg, and finally to the fact, "that, by God's help, the fulness of time had come, when the Bohemian had multiplied beyond the Teutonic magisters, and had risen above the foreigners in every science and faculty;" wherefore they contended, that what might have been grounded in reason at the first beginnings of the university was no longer adapted to present circumstances.

During these proceedings the German magisters

hindered in every way the actual realization of the new arrangements. In particular, when Lent arrived, and with it the usual time of examination for the B.A. degree, the Germans elected an examiner from each "nation" according to the old system. The Bohemians resisted, appealing to their new right to three votes, and thus the examination was prevented from taking place at all. But the exertions of the German magisters with the king and his council were eventually fruitless. It would appear that a proposal was at one time made to place natives and foreigners on an equal footing in the university, so that the rector, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and the examiners should be chosen each half-year alternately from Bohemians and foreigners, but it led to no result. On St. George's day (April 23rd), 1409, the time came for the election of the rector and the deans of faculties, but the German magisters refused to submit to the new system, and thus the elections became impossible. When more than a fortnight had elapsed after the usual day of election, King Wenceslas determined to fill up the vacant official positions in the university by an extraordinary exercise of his own authority. By the king's command a meeting of the university was convoked on May 9th, which was attended by Nicholas of Prague, as royal commissioner, accompanied by the magistrates of the Old Town. Almost all the magisters of all four "nations" were present. The royal commissioner first required the Rector, Hening of Baltenhagen,

to deliver up to him the seal and matriculation book of the university, as the insignia of the rectorial office. This he did, it is said, through fear, and Lord Nicholas then ordered a royal decree to be read in the court of the Carolinum, by which Zdenek of Labaun, a canon of Prague, Magister of Arts, and Bachelor of Medicine, who was clerk of the royal kitchen, was nominated rector of the University, and Magister Simon of Tisnow, one of Hus's younger followers, Dean of the Faculty of Arts. No mention occurs in extant notices of the deans of the other faculties or of the Faculty of Law, which indeed formed a separate body in the university, and was but slightly, if at all, affected by the change of system. The German magisters refused to submit to these nominations by royal authority, while the Bohemians willingly recognized them, and Nicholas of Prague without more ado proceeded to institute the nominees of the crown into their several offices.

The Germans now acted in accordance with their oath. Magisters, Bachelors and Students sold their goods and on an appointed day, shortly after Ascension-day (May 16th), all quitted Prague, some on foot, others on horseback or in vehicles, to the number of several thousands. Exactitude as to the details however is not to be obtained. Æneas Sylvius, in his "History of Bohemia," informs us, that two thousand left Prague in a single day, and that these were followed ere long by three thousand more, while a contemporary Bohemian annalist

states that more than twenty thousand thus departed. Most of them migrated to Leipsic, where in the course of the same year a new university was founded by the Margraves of Meissen.

This event naturally caused great excitement in Prague, and men's feelings varied a good deal. The German inhabitants doubtless bewailed the loss of the pecuniary advantages arising from such numerous sojourners, many of whom were wealthy, whereas the Bohemians saw therein an important gain to the power and influence of their own nationality. Hus, who had meanwhile recovered from his illness, addressed his congregation at Bethlehem on the subject, speaking of it as a joyful victory for Bohemia, and urging his hearers to give especial thanks to Lord Nicholas for having obtained this important concession from the king. The king himself looked upon the conspiracy and migration of the German professors as a crime, not only against the university, but also against himself and the realm, and by edict dated June 28th, pronounced their banishment at Zebrak and nominated others to their places in the university and colleges.

The results of these changes in both Bohemia and Germany were great and important. Prague had for half a century stood on a level with Paris and Oxford, as one of the most influential universities in Europe. Witness a letter from the Council of Constance to King Sigismund in 1416! "That splendid University of Prague," it runs, "was

counted among the greater jewels of our world. For of all the universities of the German nation it bore not undeservedly the character of being the greatest, flowing as there did to it from all the realms and lordships of Almayne youths and men of mature age, alike through love of virtue and study, who, seeking the treasure of philosophy and knowledge, found it there in abundance." All this was gone at one fell swoop; Prague was no longer the intellectual capital of Germany, and intellect, instead of being concentrated in one grand centre, now shone in various focal points in the lands inhabited by the Teutonic race, and developed itself with greater freedom and diversity. On the other hand, the idea of "Bohemia for the Bohemians!" became dominant throughout the realm, and with it was united a great impulse towards the development of reforming views in matters ecclesiastical. In fact the discontent of the sufferers in pocket by the migration of the Germans was completely carried away by the great stream of Church-reforming ideas, which took full possession of the minds of the Bohemian people.

Meanwhile negotiations had been going on for the release of the two captives at Bologna, Stanislas of Znaym and Stephen of Palecz. King Wenceslas's personal intercession, as well by letter addressed to the cardinals, as by oral representations made to them through his ambassador, John Cardinal of Reinstein, was eventually decisive in their favour, and they were allowed to return home

shortly after the migration of the Germans from the university. Stanislas, however, was previously constrained to "complete" his "unfinished" treatise, *i.e.* so to amend and alter it, that it was adjudged to be free from error, a judgment which was confirmed by the new pope elected by the council, Alexander V.

Meanwhile also the difference between the king and Archbishop Zbynek, as to withholding or not withholding obedience from Gregory XII., had caused great troubles and considerable excesses against the clergy, not only in Prague, but also throughout Bohemia. The Archbishop had refused to fall in with the edicts issued by the king in understanding with the cardinals and their plenipotentiaries at Prague, and the mass of the clergy had followed his example. Several members of the clerical body having suffered both in person and property from the execution of the injunctions of the royal edict, Archbishop Zbynek placed Prague and its environs, to the distance of about nine English miles, under an interdict. It would seem that Hus and his friends disapproved of this interdict, and they unquestionably paid little or no attention to it. After a sermon preached by Hus, probably with especial reference to the subject, the people rushed with outcries into the street and crowded with threats to the archbishop's palace. Though nothing worse took place, yet this was probably the cause of the retirement of the archbishop from Prague to his country seat at Raudnitz,

whither, without the king's permission or knowledge, he also conveyed the treasures usually kept in the tomb of St. Wenceslas in the cathedral. Irritated by this, the king proceeded to persecute all ecclesiastics who joined the archbishop in resisting his orders, or who put a stop to Divine service on account of the interdict. The estates and revenues of those who had quitted Prague with the archbishop were confiscated, and others were assailed, not only by the officials of the towns, but also by the common people, who bore them no goodwill on account of their inveterate abuses. Some were robbed, others insulted in various ways; some were dragged out of their houses half-naked along with their concubines and placed in the pillory; mud was thrown at them, they were ducked or hunted with ignominy out of the towns, and many laymen also, who took their part, were maltreated and banished from the different communities.

Although the new pope, Alexander V., had been elected by the council of Pisa in June, yet this persecution of the clergy in Bohemia did not reach its height till the latter part of July (1409), owing, no doubt, to the refusal of Archbishop Zbynek to recognize the pope approved and supported by the council. But, finding public opinion and royal power combined against him, he at length ceased his impotent resistance with no little loss in influence and estimation. After consulting his suffragans, his chapter and other spiritual persons,

he, on September 2nd, issued an ordinance to the clergy of his diocese, announcing his adhesion to Alexander V., as regularly elected and acknowledged by the majority of the Church after the deposition of the two preceding popes by a general council. Upon this the bells were rung, and a "Te Deum" sung at Prague, and on the next day the public joy was expressed by bonfires in front of the houses in all the streets, to the number of full six hundred, and by a procession on horseback headed by the burgomaster and magistrates in the evening with festive music.

CHAPTER V.

JOHN HUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS AT VARIANCE WITH
ARCHBISHOP ZBYNEK.

THE half-year for which Magister Zdenek of Labaun had been appointed rector of the university by the king, was now drawing to a close. He therefore on September 27th, 1409, convoked a meeting of the magisters, in which it was resolved, that the royal decree respecting the three votes of the Bohemian "nation" should be entered in the statute-books, and that all that was not in accordance with it in the existing institutions of the university should henceforth be null and void. A new mode of electing the rector of the three faculties was therefore instituted, which was to rest, as aforetime, on the basis of the division of the university into four "nations;" but the Bohemian "nation" was to choose *three* electors, and the others together *one*; and if the votes of these electors were equally divided, the outgoing rector was to have a casting vote. These resolutions were announced and ap-

proved in a full assembly of the university on October 13th, and immediately afterwards, on St. Gallus's day, October 15th, Hus was the first rector chosen under the new system for the half-year ending on St. George's day, 1410.

With this renewed elevation to the highest dignity in the University of Prague began for Hus a period of ever-increasing troubles on the path of public life, from which scarce any respite was granted him till he finally underwent a martyr's death. The endeavours for the reform of the Church, to which, after the example of the noblest spirits of several preceding centuries, he had devoted all his powers, might to a great extent have attained their end in Bohemia in peaceful and legal wise, had the highest authorities of the Church in the realm interested themselves therein, in the way in which they seemed about to do at the commencement of the Archbishopric of Zbynek Zajitz of Hasenburg. But all hope thereof vanished with the change of sentiment on the part of the ignorant and ill-informed Archbishop, who allowed himself to be drawn by contrary counsels from the good path which he had begun to tread. The injuries and insults which the archbishop and his clergy experienced in their ill-advised attempt to resist and upset the council of Pisa, exasperated them still more against Hus and his adherents, who had placed themselves in an attitude of opposition to them. Unquestionably Hus, amongst others, had disregarded the prohibition of the performance of priestly duties, which

the archbishop had issued at the beginning of the dispute. Self-evident, too, it is that, when the archbishop was compelled to give in his adhesion to Alexander V., and thus approve what he had previously condemned, the right of punishing those who had supported the winning cause must necessarily fall to the ground. But Archbishop Zbynek's advisers ere long devised more effective means of persecuting their adversaries, in order to liberate themselves from the annoyance of those adversaries' persistent exertions in the cause of reform. And although Hus had steadily rejected those doctrines of Wycliffe, which had been condemned by the Church, yet it was Wycliffism that must serve as a weapon against him; he and his friends must be branded with suspicion of heresy, as restless and dangerous people, in order that this plague-spot might cleave to all their endeavours, endeavours which the archbishop had but a short time ago himself commended and supported.

Hus had, immediately after the presentation of the complaint of the clergy against him in 1408, addressed to the archbishop an answer in writing to the accusations contained therein; but it is not known how far this was considered satisfactory or sufficient at the time. When about a year had elapsed, and the archbishop had ceased his resistance to the pope elected by the council of Pisa, he once more ordered Hus to justify himself with regard to the charges already made, and also others newly brought against him, before Magister

Maurice Rvaczka, the inquisitor. These latter consisted of statements extracted from confidential conversations held nine and ten years ago, in the parsonage of St. Michael's, and in the house of Wenceslas the cupmaker, whence it was endeavoured to prove that Hus had accepted Wycliffe's teaching as to the sacrament of the altar, and also the doctrine, that a priest in mortal sin does not make the sacrament. These things were brought forward against him by his predecessor in the preachship at Bethlehem, the priest Jan Protiva of Novaves, who had in 1407 exchanged his benefice of Bystritz for that of St. Clement at Porzicz, a suburb of Prague, and had thenceforth been living in Prague. This man regularly attended Hus's sermons at Bethlehem, and carefully marked what he saw, in order to find occasion against him. One day Hus noticed him, as he sate with head bent down, in a grey mantle, and concealing his face with his cowl, and called out to him from the pulpit in the midst of an explanation of the difference between the laws of God and the laws of men: "Write that down, cowlèd monk! and carry it over to yon side," *i.e.* to the archbishop's palace on the Kleinseite, on the other side of the river. In these complaints what Hus had said at the synod of 1405 against taking payment for the administration of the sacraments, was also brought as a charge against him, although it had then been publicly approved by the vicar general himself. And his preaching at Bethlehem was accused of

seducing people from their appointed spiritual pastors, whereas they ought to remain in their own parishes, and there receive instruction respecting the laws of Christ. Hus was therefore called upon to prove his right to preach to people belonging to other clergy, to perform Divine service, and to administer the sacraments in his chapel. This was a strange requirement to emanate from the archbishop's chancery, such right being entirely indubitable, both by the foundation of the chapel Bethlehem itself, and by the archbishop's confirmation thereof. Finally, from the part taken by Hus on the question of the three votes of the Bohemian "nation" in the university, a charge was also made against him of causing discord between the Bohemians and Germans.

Hus not only gave the answer requisite for his justification at a hearing appointed by the archbishop, but also refuted the charges of heresy, and of inciting the Bohemians against the Germans, by a kind of public declaration. He appealed especially to his hearers at Bethlehem to bear witness that he had always taught the contrary of the Wycliffite doctrine respecting the sacrament of the altar. Archbishop Zbynek, however, and his advisers paid no heed thereto, but in order to strengthen their hands for the campaign against him and his tendencies, sent a deputation to Pope Alexander V., provided, it is said, with rich and abundant presents. After the delivery of these, it was stated to the pope that in Prague and in the realm of Bohemia, in the Mar-

gravate of Moravia, and also in certain other lands, the hearts of many were infected with the erroneous articles of John Wycliffe, and especially with his doctrine respecting the sacrament of the altar, so that it was requisite to make use of a swift remedy, and as such remedy it was suggested, that, without regard to any right or privilege to the contrary, no preaching should be allowed, save in cathedral, collegiate, parish, or conventual churches. This was specially aimed at Hus, whose chapel Bethlehem did not belong to any of the four classes thus enumerated, although there was as yet no pretext for inhibiting him personally from preaching. This deputation was headed by Jaroslaw, Bishop of Sarepta.

Archbishop Zbynek had hitherto enjoyed no great favour at the court of Alexander V., through having so long refused to recognize him and submit to his authority. To this we must ascribe the fact, that the appeal of the five students made against him in the previous year had not been altogether without effect. It had apparently been delivered by Magister Marek of Hradetz to Pope Alexander shortly after his election. The pope had placed it in the hands of one of his "auditors," whom he had empowered to cite the Archbishop of Prague for trial. This citation was actually issued on December 8th, 1409, and the archbishop was thereby required to appear personally at the papal court. But his ambassadors, who arrived meanwhile, soon turned the current into a direction advantageous to the archbishop. So that twelve days afterwards

(December 20th), Pope Alexander issued a bull, in which he revoked his previous decree against the archbishop, and commissioned him to take four magisters in theology and two doctors of ecclesiastical law as assessors, and, in accordance with their opinion, to prohibit the enunciation of the erroneous articles, by virtue of the apostolic authority, with which he invested him; to forbid all preaching in any other places whatsoever, save and except the four classes of churches aforesaid; to require Wycliffe's books to be given up to him by all who possessed them, "that they might be removed from the eyes of the faithful;" and to proceed against all who resisted any portion of this decree by penal measures to the exclusion of all further right of appeal.

Pope Alexander's bull did not arrive at Prague—owing probably to the bad state of the roads in the winter—till about March 9th. Archbishop Zbynek immediately appointed the prescribed commission of four magisters in theology and two doctors of law, to examine the writings of Wycliffe. As soon as Hus became cognizant of the tenour of the bull, he appealed to the pope against it, disregarding the prohibition of so doing contained in the bull itself. He grounded his appeal on the fact that the pope was ill-informed, no one in Bohemia having yet been convicted of having obstinately and contumaciously adhered to Wycliffe's doctrines—yea, it being in direct opposition to the public declaration of the archbishop at the synod

of 1408, that he had not found any one holding error in Prague or elsewhere in Bohemia. There was, of course, no doubt from the first that the magisters and doctors appointed by the archbishop would consider the books erroneous and heretical. In accordance with their report, and in concert with his suffragans and with the dean and chapter of Prague, as well as other dignitaries, the archbishop caused his sentence to be proclaimed at the St. Vitus synod (June 10th), whereby all the writings of Wycliffe, that had been given up to him "to be removed from the eyes of the faithful," were to be burned with fire; the five students, who had appealed against the surrender of the books, and their legal representative, as also all others who had hitherto refrained from giving up their copies and who had kept their possession of them secret, were warned to surrender them within six days; defending and teaching Wycliffe's errors, especially those respecting the sacrament of the altar, was prohibited under pain of deprivation of ecclesiastical benefices and other penalties, for the due execution whereof the archbishop threatened to employ the secular arm, and, in particular, the assistance of King Wenceslas, as equally with himself called upon by the pope to that effect; and, finally, preaching in all "private" places—that is to say, everywhere except in cathedral, collegiate, parish, and conventual churches—was, after the expiration of six days from the publication of that prohibition, forbidden under pain of excommunication.

Such was the fatal step by which the religious movement in Bohemia, which had been unfolding itself with ever increasing prosperity since the days of Waldhauser and Milicz, was now dragged from its path of peaceful and legal development on to the rugged road of resistance and insurrection. Archbishop Zbynek and his advisers thought fit to make a use at once crafty and violent of the Church's power in order to crush all efforts for Church reform, and thereby seriously injured the respect and reverence hitherto entertained for ecclesiastical authority. For the state of opinion respecting the necessity of a change in the corrupt condition of the clergy was already such in Bohemia, that a firm resolve had been unconsciously formed to offer active resistance to those who opposed it. In consequence of this growth and development of a cause otherwise identical, there came to pass this difference between Hus and Milicz or Mathias of Janow, that, whereas they meekly submitted to external authority, when it declared against them, Hus had the boldness to cast off blind and implicit obedience, when he saw that an improper use was being made of Church authority against the very end and object of the Church. He laid no great stress on the defence of the much-decried doctrines of Wycliffe. What in them had been regularly adjudged to be erroneous he was always ready to reject, although he took exceeding delight in Wycliffe's writings considered as a whole. But in the prohibition of preaching in chapels, intended

as it was to put a stop to the reprehension of dominant abuses among the clergy and to the guidance of the people to a deeper conception of Christian doctrine, he descried an unlawful assault upon the freedom of God's Word, and thus an opposition to the law of Christ Himself. This was for him a matter in which it was his duty to obey God rather than man.

Pope Alexander V., to whom he had appealed, having meanwhile died (May 3rd), Hus determined to make a renewed appeal to the new pope, John XXIII., who had not long previously (June 1st) signified, according to custom, his accession to the rector and University of Prague. But his firm intention was, from the first, not to submit to the prohibition of preaching in chapels. He therefore, on the first Sunday after the publication of the prohibition (June 22nd), preached in Bethlehem to a congregation of unusual magnitude. After making mention of the deceased pope, who had by his bull commanded the extirpation of errors in Bohemia, he testified, in the first place, that, thanks be to God, he had never yet seen any Bohemian who was a heretic—that is, such a one that he had obstinately persisted in errors contrary to Holy Scripture—and declared that the Bohemian “prelates” had wrongly informed the pope in that respect. “They lie!” shouted the exasperated people. He spoke, further, against the projected burning of Wycliffe's writings, which contained, he said, much that was good. He announced his

intention of appealing against the archbishop's order, and asked the people, whether they would stand by him therein. Again they cried: "We will and do stand by you." Then he finally declared, that he would not cease preaching, even though he were driven into exile or were to die in prison, and exhorted them to steadfastness; for a need was arising, even as in the Old Testament according to the ordinance of Moses, to gird on the sword and defend the Word of God. These were words which found an echo in all classes of the population, not only in Prague, but also in the whole realm of Bohemia. Three days afterwards (June 25th), there was read and published before a public notary and witnesses an APPEAL to Pope John XXIII., in the names of JOHN HUS; of Lord Zdislaw of Zviretitz, an M.A.; of three bachelors and three students of the University of Prague; as also in the name of all other masters and doctors, licentiates, bachelors and students of the said university; also of the lords, barons, knights, esquires, rulers of circles, districts, cities, castles, towns, villages, and communities; and of all manner of persons, spiritual and lay, who adhered to them therein.

The three students were three out of the five who had taken part in the former appeal, two of the number having retired for fear of excommunication. Zdislaw of Zviretitz, otherwise of Wartenberg, was a young magister, presented for his degree on March 11th of the selfsame year by Hus himself.

The appellants employed as their chief argument against the burning of Wycliffe's writings, that it was unreasonable to desire to destroy works of logical, mathematical, philosophical, and other tenour, containing no errors, but a great deal that was good; and that it was also unreasonable to burn even heretical books, because the learned required acquaintance with them in order to be able to refute them and defend Christian truth; declaring moreover, with a view to their enemies, that they had no intention of defending or holding any error contained in any books whatever, neither had they hitherto held or defended anything of the kind. Against the prohibition of preaching in chapels, they appealed particularly to the privileges of the chapel Bethlehem and the beneficial nature of its foundation; and, withal, to the ordinance of Christ, according to which the Word of God ought not to be bound, but the preaching thereof ought to be in very deed most free, as being profitable to the Church above all things; and to the example of Christ, who always preached, even unto His death, in schools, in the streets, on the highways, on the sea, in the fields, and in the desert.

On June 15th, the day before the publication of the archbishop's orders in the synod, a meeting of the university was convoked with regard to them—their tenour being already known by rumour—by the rector, John Sindel, a celebrated magister in medicine, who was Hus's immediate successor. Then and there, in the presence of a large number

of magisters, bachelors and students, it was declared, that the university did not agree with the archbishop and "prelates" in their project of burning the writings of Wycliffe, and it was resolved to petition the king to prevent such burning, lest shame should come therefrom on him, on the whole realm, and on the university. All the magisters assented to this resolution, save those few whom the archbishop had selected as his commissioners to sit in judgment upon the books. King Wenceslas, upon the receipt of this petition, immediately sent to the archbishop to make inquiries. The archbishop in consequence postponed his intention of burning the books on the morrow after their condemnation, and promised to do nothing without the king's consent, and in particular to wait till the arrival of Margrave Jost, who was then expected at Prague, and with whom the king intended to take counsel on the subject. The margrave bore the reputation of great devotion to literature, but he was not in the habit of slaking his thirst for reading at his own expense, but at that of others, from whom he borrowed books, which he was not over ready to return. A few days later, June 21st, the university also issued a public declaration, that it did not approve the sentence of the archbishop with respect to the books, and would not by silence with regard to it render itself an accomplice in such an act of unrighteousness.

Hus's appeal against the condemnation of Wycliffe's writings and against the prohibition of

preaching in chapels, as well as these other tokens of resistance to the archbishop's authority, irritated him or his advisers into a fresh act of hostility against Hus. That is to say, the archbishop sent the pope a complaint against him, in which he designated him the chief author and defender of the spread of Wycliffite views in Bohemia, accusing him of preaching in disregard of the prohibition of preaching in chapels, and mentioning especially the dangerous tenour of his sermon at Bethlehem on June 22nd, not without various exaggerations and possibly additions. On this basis he requested the pope—(1) to empower him (the archbishop), without further regard to any appeal whatever, to proceed under the commission of the late Pope Alexander V. with respect to Wycliffe's errors, and (2) to cite Hus personally to the papal court, and bring him to answer and to punishment for his transgressions. As Margrave Jost continued absent from Prague for a long time, the archbishop appears to have considered himself released from his engagements, and proceeded to the actual execution of his decree with regard to Wycliffe's writings. On Wednesday, July 16th, he summoned the "prelates" and many other ecclesiastics to the archiepiscopal palace on the Kleinseite, caused the doors to be closed and guarded by armed men, and the copies of Wycliffe's works, which had been given up to him, to be placed on a pile of faggots in the courtyard. He then with his own hands set the pile on fire and thus delivered the books to the

flames. When they were fairly on fire, a loud "Te Deum" was sung, and a funeral knell was rung, "in the expectation," as a contemporary annalist says, "that they had now the end of all troubles, whereas, by the permission of God, the righteous Judge, the troubles had but first taken their beginning."

It would seem that King Wenceslas was not at that time at Prague, or this book-burning would scarcely have taken place without interference on his part. As soon as Archbishop Zbynek learned the king's sentiments on the subject, he betook himself to Raudnitz, and thence, on July 18th, excommunicated Hus and all who had participated directly or indirectly in the appeal to the pope. Great disturbances thence arose among the population of Prague, the major part of which was antagonistic to the archbishop and clergy, especially to the canons and the incumbents of city parishes. When at the archbishop's command the priests began on the ensuing Sunday to publish the excommunications in the churches at Divine service, which they were required to repeat every Sunday and holy day, the people broke out in many places into acts of violent resistance. In the cathedral itself, on the festival of Saint Mary Magdalene (July 22nd), such an uproar arose, that the priests who were celebrating High Mass, and also forty others who were celebrating at other altars, were obliged to desist and leave the church. On the same day at St. Stephen's, in the New Town,

when the preacher spoke in condemnatory terms of Hus, six men rushed upon him with drawn swords and threatened him with death. Elsewhere the priests, when publishing the excommunications, were exhorted by the people to refrain from telling lies in their discourses. Excesses on the one side were met by excesses on the other. Such unauthorized critics and instructors of the clergy were seized by the priests and choirmen in the cathedral itself, beaten, mauled and slapped in the face, or dragged to the common room or refectory of the clergy, and there mercilessly scourged with rods. The choirmen actually proceeded so far as to seize adherents of Hus outside the cathedral and beat them with rods. Similar deeds were done by the monks at the monastery of the Mother of God in the New Town and elsewhere. However, Hus's party eventually proved the stronger, and even some of the king's courtiers placed themselves at its head in various enterprises against the clergy, till all the incumbents of Prague were frightened into desisting from the publication of the excommunications. The populace gave vent to their ill-will against the clergy hostile to Hus by composing libellous songs and singing them in the streets, which the other party requited by effusions of contrary tenour. The archbishop's educational deficiencies were remarked upon in a song beginning—

“Zajitz, Bishop A, B, C,
Burnt the books, but ne'er knew he
What was in them written.”

It was also commonly reported that the authors of the book-burning kept the handsomest copies for themselves, and delivered old parchments and registers to the flames in their stead. To put a stop to further disorder, King Wenceslas finally commanded both sides to cease from reciprocal annoyance, and forbade all singing of libellous verses in the streets under threat of capital punishment, at the same time ordering the archbishop to make compensation to those whose books he had destroyed.

Hus and four of his friends in the university now came forwards against the book-burning in the following fashion. They announced a public disputation in defence of certain of Wycliffe's works, with regard to which they felt confident they could prove that no errors whatever were in them. Hus undertook the defence of Wycliffe's work on the Holy Trinity; Magister Jakaubek of Stribro of that on the ten commandments; Simon of Tisnow of that on the proofs of propositions; Zdislaw of Zviretitz of that on universals; and Magister Procop of Pilsen of that on ideas. This disputation was conducted as advertised on five successive days, from July 27th to 31st, each disputation occupying one day.

By the confirmation of Alexander's bull, just as if the realm had been infected with errors, although not a single person had been proven guilty in that respect, King Wenceslas felt affected as by a personal insult. He also, as well as his courtiers,

agreed with Hus in looking upon the prohibition of preaching in chapels as a violation of the freedom of the Word of God. He therefore determined to interest himself in favour of the persecuted party, and make intercession for it at the papal court. And shortly afterwards, on the arrival of the nuncio to announce the accession of John XXIII., he availed himself of the opportunity of writing a congratulatory letter to the pope (September 12th, 1410) to mention withal his astonishment at his predecessor's bull limiting the preaching of the Word of God, whereas how could the Church advance in faith, hope, and love, save by the proclamation of the Gospel? He complained of the manner in which his realm was aspersed by unfriendly calumniators, and requested the revocation of the orders given in Alexander's bull. He also wrote to several cardinals, to whom he had heard that the matter was entrusted, and intercessory letters were also written by Queen Sophia, by several Bohemian lords, in particular by the High Steward, Lacek of Kravary, and also—no doubt at the king's instigation—by the burgomasters and aldermen of the old, new, and lesser towns of Prague. Queen Sophia's letter contained Hus's favourite expressions, that the Word of God ought not to be bound, but ought to be preached in the squares, in the streets, on the housetops; yea, everywhere, as required. Lord Lacek expressed his astonishment at the prohibition of preaching in the chapel Bethlehem, with

which no monastery or parish church in the realm could stand a comparison in that respect. "What will be the good of the chapels in our castles," wrote he, "in which the Word of the Lord has often been preached? Or how shall we hear the Lord's Word when we are in the field, a time when it ought most especially to be heard?" The magistrates of the old town appealed to their right of patronage to one of the two preacher-ships, and petitioned the pope to confirm the chapel.

At the papal court, which was then at Bologna, Hus's appeal, as well as the archbishop's petition against it, had been placed in the hands of Cardinal Odo di Colonna, with directions to fulfil the archbishop's wishes. The cardinal accordingly issued an order to the Archbishop of Prague (August 25th) to take further proceedings according to the bull of Alexander V., and likewise a citation to Hus to appear personally before the papal tribunal.

The letters of King Wenceslas and the rest had scarcely started on their way, when these orders arrived at Prague. Archbishop Zbynek consequently issued (September 24th) an "aggravation" of the excommunications against Hus and his associates. By this King Wenceslas was incensed anew, and wrote again (September 30th) to Pope John, requesting him in curt and decided language to annul his decrees and enjoin silence on the parties, who were disputing about the works of Wycliffe. He said that he did not intend to put up with such quarrels in his realm, none of his

subjects having been convicted of error or heresy on account of the books. He made a special request, that the chapel Bethlehem might be preserved and confirmed, and that Hus might continue peacefully to preach the Word of God there, and be released from appearing personally at Rome. It was not convenient—he wrote—to his realm to place a man, so useful in preaching, in danger from his enemies on the highways, and thereby irritate the whole population. If any one wished to accuse him, he must do so in Bohemia, before the University or some other competent judge. King Wenceslas wrote also to Cardinal Odo di Colonna, inviting him to come to Bohemia to hear and judge with his own ears. Queen Sophia wrote too (October 1st and 2nd) to the pope and to the cardinals, mentioning expressly in her letter to the pope, that she had frequently heard the Word of God in the chapel Bethlehem, and especially imploring the cardinals to seek to bring the matter to a satisfactory settlement, “in order to preclude evil consequences.” Her lord and husband, she said, in concert with herself and the lords, would take suitable measures to prevent the further spread of disorder. With the same intent Wenceslas commissioned Dr. John Naz, his ambassador at the papal court, to represent to the pope, that he could easily punish the slanderers and adversaries of his realm himself, but refrained from so doing from humble reverence to the apostolic see. The king gave further confidential orders to Magister John of

Reinstein, surnamed Cardinal, who was one of Hus's friends, while Magister Jerome of Seidenberg, the king's third plenipotentiary, received severe and threatening rebukes, the king having learned from an intercepted letter from Jaroslaw, Bishop of Sarepta, that he had conducted himself disloyally towards his sovereign, and aided the archbishop's agents to obtain the decrees against Hus and his adherents.

Hus also sent a written petition to the pope, entreating to be released from appearing personally before his court, assigning as a reason the danger he would be in on the journey on account of his numerous enemies, and appointing procurators with full powers for his defence. The chief of these was his friend Magister John of Jesenitz, who had taken the degree of bachelor of laws in 1407, and was then apparently continuing his studies at Bologna. Hus was at that time in a frame of joyous delight on account of the favourable sentiments of the king and his court, not because he was himself thereby guaranteed against personal danger, but because he thence hoped for aid towards the progress of the cause which he had so deeply at heart. His name was already well known in England among those who, amidst persecution, were still treading in the steps of Wycliffe, and he now received a letter from one of Wycliffe's former fellow-labourers, Richard Fitz, dated September 8th, 1410, which greatly encouraged him and his followers, and specially

saluted, along with Hus, Magister Jakaubek of Stribro, as Hus's "helper in the Gospel." Hus addressed the people publicly in a sermon with regard to this letter, the congregation consisting of about ten thousand hearers, and replied to it with a salutation "from the Church of Christ in Bohemia to the Church of Christ in England," making joyful mention of the good progress of the Gospel in Bohemia; for the king and his court, the queen, the lords and the commonalty, were all defenders of the Word of Christ; the people would listen to nothing but Holy Scripture, especially the gospels and epistles; and when they found a preacher of the truth, they flocked to him in villages, towns, and castles, avoiding the disorderly clergy. He also plainly expressed his firm resolve to suffer for the truth. It must also have been a great encouragement to him, when in the month of September, the theological faculty at Bologna, a city belonging to the pope, in which the archbishop's ambassadors had used their utmost exertions to obtain approval for the burning of Wycliffe's books, formally refused to approve it. Of this Magister John of Jesenitz obtained written testimony, dated November 25th, 1410, from brother Thomas of Udine, prior of the Dominicans in Bologna, and then Dean of the Faculty of Theology in that university.

King Wenceslas's letters to the papal court in favour of Hus produced no effect whatever. With a pope like John XXIII., a man of notoriously

wicked life, who, regardless of the decrees of the Council of Pisa respecting the projected reform of the Church in head and members, rapaciously carried on the old simoniacal system for lucre, it was difficult to obtain consideration for a man like Hus, who was, at any rate, well known as a zealous opponent of that system in his own country. And perhaps, after all, it made no great difference, if Archbishop Zbynek's ambassadors, who were sent to the aid of the coadjutor Bishop Jaroslav at Bologna, Zdenek Dlanhy of Chrast, and Dr. Kunes of Zvole, did present a number of horses, caskets, and rings to Pope John from the archbishop, and handsome rings to Cardinals Colonna and Orsini. Anyhow, the result of their efforts was, that Cardinal Odo di Colonna, at the expiration of the specified time for Hus's appearance at Bologna (February, 1411) issued sentence of excommunication against him for non-appearance. Archbishop Zbynek ordered this to be immediately proclaimed at Prague, and his orders were obeyed on March 15th in all the churches save those of St. Michael and St. Benedict in the old town. The incumbent of the former was Magister Christian of Prachatitz, a sincere friend of Hus's; that of the latter, brother Nicholas, a knight of the Teutonic order, of whom nothing further is known.

These proceedings irritated King Wenceslas afresh, and he now put into execution the intention, which he had announced to the papal court, of punishing the defamers of his realm

himself. As the archbishop and his advisers had paid no regard to the king's order to make compensation to the owners of the books, which they had burned, Wenceslas now caused various estates, farms, and houses belonging to the archbishop and certain dignitaries, canons and other ecclesiastics to be put under sequestration, that such compensation might be made out of their rents. The king nominated as his commissioners for this purpose the burgomasters and aldermen of the three towns of Prague and of Hradcany, and also the burgrave of the Vyssegrad, Racek of Dvoretz, and the chief usher, Voksa of Waldstein, who soon put the royal commands into execution. The archbishop employed his spiritual power to resist these proceedings in the usual way. He issued an edict from Raudnitz (May 2nd), against the commissioners, warning them as appropriators of Church property to restore the sequestered estates and revenues within three days under pain of excommunication; nay, when nothing was gained by this, he proceeded, as he had done four years previously, to lay the whole of Prague under an interdict.

This uncircumspect severity had not the success which the archbishop probably expected from it. King Wenceslas was still more exasperated, and began to persecute all who obeyed the archbishop's order with regard to the suspension of Divine service. Some had their revenues sequestered, and others were driven from their benefices. Many of the

incumbents in Prague and elsewhere were terrified into disobedience to the archbishop, and performed service in their churches, as was also the case with the residentiaries in the cathedral, who asked and obtained absolution from the papal curia, on the ground that they had been compelled thereto by the secular power. Much less was the order obeyed by the clergy of Hus's party, who considered it unrighteous and illegal. King Wenceslas took precautions also to prevent the archbishop from removing, as in 1409, the treasures of the cathedral from Prague. On May 6th, he rode in person to Hradcany, went to the house of Canon John of Kralovitz, who was then probably subdean, and caused several other dignitaries and canons to be summoned thither. These were compelled to attend the king, who himself rode on horseback into the cathedral, where he caused all the treasures to be opened and exhibited to him, and after satisfying himself that all was in order, rode back again from the Hradschin. He also issued a special commission to Kunes of Olbramovitz and the aldermen of the three towns of Prague, who in execution thereof caused excavations to be made in the cathedral during the evening and night, in order to explore secret receptacles. They only found, however, four secret niches, which were empty. They further took possession of all the treasures, *i.e.* principally the holy relics, which were magnificently ornamented, and the coffin of St. Wenceslas, and conveyed them the next day (May 7th) to Karlstein.

Not long afterwards King Wenceslas took his seat in person at the Grand Court of Justice during the Whitsun Ember days, and on June 5th, in conjunction with the lords of the realm, issued a severe edict against the arbitrary extension of the power of the spiritual tribunals to the detriment of the temporal courts. If any one should cite another respecting a civil matter before a spiritual tribunal, or if any one should venture to act as judge in such tribunal, the king's officers, in conjunction with the Burgrave of Prague, were to take possession of his revenues and property, and hold them until satisfaction was made to the person cited for damages and expenses. But should the person citing possess no property, then he was to be arrested and imprisoned during the king's pleasure or until the lords should give sentence in his case. This edict appears to have at once resulted in active interference with many spiritual persons and their estates.

Archbishop Zbynek, even as his whilome predecessor, John of Jenstein, was at length constrained to understand, that longer contest with King Wenceslas, respecting a matter in which the king interested himself personally, was dangerous and beyond his strength. It therefore came to pass, that the ill-success of the harsh methods which he had hitherto employed inclined him to have recourse to moderate measures with a view to the renewal of peace. It would seem that this was greatly forwarded by the admonitions of certain

persons of distinction then at Prague, in particular of Rudolf, Duke of Saxony, of Stibor of Stiboritz, Voyvode of Transylvania, King Sigismund's plenipotentiary at the Bohemian court, and of the High Steward Lord Lacek of Kravary, who had been lately appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Moravia. An agreement was come to under which Archbishop Zbynek submitted, as regards all matters in question with Hus and his adherents, to the decision of King Wenceslas and his privy council, as friendly arbitrators, it being conditioned that Duke Rudolf, the Voyvode Stibor, and the High Steward Lacek, were to take part in the deliberations; but if no decision were arrived at during their stay in Prague, then the king was to have the power of final decision with the aid of other lords and nobles, whom he might think fit to consult. A document to this effect was drawn up on July 3rd, in the first place on the part of Hus and his adherents, running in the names of Magister Simon of Tisnow, the rector, and the whole society of the University of Prague; of Thomas of Lysá, Dean of the Faculty of Arts; of Magister John Hus himself, and of all who had adhered to him in his appeal to the pope; and moreover of John Gauditensky, Doctor of Medicine, and five other magisters of the University of Prague. These all met in a room at St. James's Monastery in the Old Town, and gave in their adhesion to the agreement before nine witnesses, seven of whom were distinguished lords and nobles of the realm, and two court ecclesiastics in atten-

dance on Wenceslas. Afterwards Archbishop Zbynek formally accepted the same in his own name and in the name of the rest of the clergy, before witnesses assembled in his cabinet in the archiepiscopal palace on the Kleinseite. These were all ecclesiastics of the party hostile to Hus, and among them were Dr. Adam of Nezetitz, formerly vicar general, Canon Zdenek of Chrast, and John Protiva, incumbent of St. Clement's and formerly preacher at Bethlehem.

Besides Duke Rudolf, the Voyvode Stibor and Lord Lacek, King Wenceslas summoned to council Wenceslas, Patriarch of Antioch; Conrad, Bishop of Olmütz; Sulek, Provost of Choteschow; Lord Wenceslas of Donin; Bohus, Commander of the Knights of St. John at Manetin; Peter Zmrzlek of Svojsin, Master of the Mint; and Nicholas of Prague, who was now Chief Secretary of State. Three days after the acceptance of the above agreement by the parties, *i.e.* on July 6th, the arbitrators issued their decision. The archbishop was to make submission to the king as his lord, and to write to the pope, that he knew of no errors in the land of Bohemia, but that there were difficulties between himself and the magisters of Hus's party, with respect to which he had had recourse to the king. He was therefore to request from the pope absolution for Hus, who was under papal excommunication, to absolve those whom he had himself excommunicated, and also to remove the interdict. Both parties were to cease litigation at the papal court and to recall

their procurators; the king was then to take counsel with the bishops, doctors and prelates, and also with the lay princes, lords and nobles, respecting errors and heresies, should any be found amongst either clergy or laity, and with the advice of clergy and laity to purge out and punish the guilty. On the other hand, the revenues or incomes, of which the priests had been deprived, were to be restored, and those who had been arrested were to be released. At the same time both the clergy and the university, as well as the lords and gentry in general, were to remain in possession of their rights, with an express proviso, that the spirituality was not to interfere with the laity by means of its newly invented rules of law, even as it had been decreed in the foregoing parliament. An especial clause declared that, having ascertained that the late action of the people of Prague against the clergy had been taken by the king's command, the archbishop annulled the edicts he had issued against them, and "neither took it evil of them nor laid aught evil to their charge."

This agreement might have made an end to the then existing variance between the archbishop and the section of the clergy that adhered to John Hus; nay, it might perhaps have resulted in the timely introduction of reforms in matters ecclesiastical in Bohemia, had it been honestly and intelligently carried into execution. But to this it never came. Archbishop Zbynek presented himself personally

before the king and unquestionably made the desired submission, but failed thereby to regain his former favour. It would seem that his submissiveness led the king to conceive a wish to make him, like John of Jenstein, feel his power, and thus Wenceslas behaved with harshness and unkindness towards him personally. It is still more probable that, over and above this, the archbishop regretted the agreement, by which he thought he had placed himself too completely in the king's hands, and that he was also egged on by his advisers, to whose projects against Hus the agreement presented a serious obstacle. According to the decision of the arbitrators, the archbishop was to remove the interdict, and he did so; but he refused to release from excommunication the clergy who had not ceased from the performance of Divine service during the interdict, maintaining that this was a sin for which they must seek absolution from the pope. The other party argued that the archbishop, who had issued the excommunications, had likewise the right of granting release from them, whereto he was expressly bound by the agreement; and that it was no sin in the priests who had performed Divine service, because the interdict was not legitimate, but void, referring the archbishop to his own acknowledgment of the guiltlessness of the citizens of Prague, against whom the interdict had been issued. To this effect, Stephen Palecz expressed himself in a special pamphlet; and King Wenceslas urged the archbishop to make a written declaration

to the same effect. This, however, he refused to do ; neither would he write the letter to the pope, according to the decision of the arbitrators, in the form laid before him by the king's command. As, therefore, the bishop failed to fulfil the agreement, it also remained partially unfulfilled on the part of the king. Many priests were not restored to their estates and revenues ; others suffered new oppressions, as occasion arose ; and the archbishop himself complained that the king's courtiers invaded his spiritual rights, and that libels were composed and placarded or distributed against him. He had at that time a dispute with the Provost of Prague, George of Janovitz, in which the latter is said to have opposed him with force and arms. The king, before whom the archbishop was said to have wished to lay his complaint, refused to grant him an audience, and exhibited his ill-will towards him in various ways, so that, finding himself in danger, he quitted Prague five weeks after the date of the agreement.

Although it was thus manifest that the archbishop had no intention of abiding by the agreement, Hus nevertheless made an attempt to turn it, as far as might be, to his own advantage. He wrote a letter of entreaty to the pope, declaring his belief and repudiating as false all charges of erroneous doctrines, in particular denying that he had taught that the substance of material bread remained in the sacrament of the altar, or that a priest in mortal sin did not make the sacrament.

He excused his non-appearance at Rome by the danger to his life which menaced him on the road from the plots of his enemies, especially the Germans; appealed to the fact that he had been reconciled to the archbishop by the arbitrators, and entreated that, this being taken into consideration, he might be released from the citation. To give this letter greater weight, he read it publicly himself (September 1st), in a full assembly of magisters of the University of Prague convoked for the purpose by the rector, Simon of Tisnow, who, in accordance with an unanimous resolution, caused the university seal to be affixed to it. He also wrote at the same time to the College of Cardinals, referring especially to the fact that the archbishop's anger had originally arisen against him for adhering to them, when the renunciation of obedience to Gregory XII. was meeting with violent opposition from the archbishop. It is possible that Hus's letters of entreaty were also supported by a letter from King Wenceslas to the pope, which the king certainly contemplated writing after the conclusion of the agreement between the parties.

Archbishop Zbynek meanwhile bethought himself of other means for the maintenance of his power, which could scarcely have led to peace, but rather to greater disturbances between the spiritual and temporal authorities in Bohemia. He betook himself to Litomysl, no doubt to consult with Bishop John, who was adversely inclined towards

King Wenceslas, and thence sent the king a letter dated September 5th, in which he reproached him with unfriendly and partial behaviour towards himself and with non-observance of the agreement, and declared that, since the king would not put a stop to the wrongs that were being done him, he was compelled to go to King Sigismund, to lay his complaints before him and request his intercession on his behalf. The whole form and style of this letter indicates that it was no mere intercession that was contemplated by the archbishop, but some more violent proceeding on the part of Sigismund against Wenceslas, towards whom Sigismund had never acted honestly. But these intentions were never fulfilled, being cut short unexpectedly by the hand of death. Archbishop Zbynek quitted Litomysl, travelled through Moravia, and arrived at Presburg, but there fell ill, and died on September 28th, 1411. His corpse was conveyed to Prague, and buried in a marble tomb in a chapel under the new tower of the cathedral.

The death of Margrave Jost in January, 1411, thus followed by that of Archbishop Zbynek in the same year, smoothed the way for a reconciliation between Wenceslas and Sigismund, which accordingly came to pass as related in the introductory chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN HUS IN CONFLICT WITH THE PAPAL POWER.

SHORTLY before the death of Archbishop Zbynek, and while he was still either at Litomysl or on his way to Hungary, an embassy arrived at Prague from King Henry IV. of England, which was also accredited to King Sigismund of Hungary. As several English magisters were members of or attachés to it, some of the Bohemian magisters, anxious probably for intelligence from the country of Wycliffe, paid a formal visit to them at their lodgings in the Old Town, taking with them in procession a number of bachelors and students. Among the English was a Licentiate in Law, John Stokes, with whom the Bohemians wished for further conversation after the conclusion of their brief morning visit. With the consent of the rector, they therefore invited him to the Carolinum for the afternoon, but he was persuaded by another member of the embassy, Sir Hartung Glux,* to

* This name, if correct, is indicative of a German rather than an Englishman. Another "Hartung" is mentioned in Palacky's "Documenta," p. 406; and in p. 408 the name of "Jux" occurs.

decline the invitation. Shortly afterwards reports became rife of language held by both Stokes and Glux respecting Wycliffe and his followers, which was extremely adverse to the views entertained by the party of Hus. Thinking this detrimental to the honour of the university, several magisters betook themselves to Stokes with a public notary and asked him plainly, whether he intended to abide by his statements or no. He replied to the effect, that whoever read or studied the works of Wycliffe, be his mental disposition and qualities ever so good, and be he ever so firm in the faith, must necessarily in course of time sink into the mire of heresy. As the Bohemian magisters considered such language to contain an implication against themselves, Hus caused a notice to be affixed to the door of the ambassador's residence, stating that it was his intention on Sunday, September 13th, to hold a disputation respecting Stokes's words, and challenging him according to the custom of the schools to appear in the public hall of the Carolinum and there maintain his opinion. Stokes did not reply till the day appointed, and then by a placard on the door of the cathedral, stating that as he had come for another reason, *i.e.* on an embassy, he did not consider it his duty to appear and argue; but if Hus or any one else thought fit to go to Paris or the court of Rome, or any other approved university, which would be impartial between the parties, he would there defend his statements, adding, arrogantly, that if the other could not afford

the journey, he would himself provide his expenses. He thus by implication justified the language ascribed to him, and also added expressly that, when questioned as to Wycliffe and public opinion respecting him in England, he had replied that Wycliffe was there considered a heretic and his teaching condemned as heretical. Hus nevertheless held the disputation without the presence of Stokes, defending Wycliffe's teaching, and saying, that "he did not believe Wycliffe to be a heretic, neither however did he deny him to be so, but hoped that he was not a heretic, but one of those predestined to salvation."

After the death of Archbishop Zbynek the archbishopric was placed in the hands of administrators. No less than twenty-four candidates entered the field for it, all ready to spend money to the utmost extent of their resources, whether at the papal court or elsewhere, amongst whom was John, Bishop of Litomysl, whom King Sigismund had unsuccessfully supported at the vacancy in 1404. But the victory was won by a man almost unknown among the clergy, Magister ALBIK, King Wenceslas's body physician. His success was doubtless owing to the action of the king, to whom it was a matter of importance to have the see filled by an archbishop devoted to him. In order to anticipate the action of the papal court, Albik was unanimously elected by the chapter on October 29th, 1411, only a month after the occurrence of the vacancy. Pope John XXIII, afterwards asserted, that during Archbishop

Zbynek's lifetime he had determined to reserve to the Apostolic See the nomination of a successor, but the election having taken place before this reservation became known either to the chapter or to the person elected, he declared indeed the election invalid, but by the power reserved to himself nominated Albik archbishop by a bull dated from Rome January 25th, 1412.

Albik of Uniczow was a Moravian by birth and a German by language, B.A. of Prague 1382, and M.A. 1385. He studied both law and medicine, taking the degree of Bachelor of Laws in 1389 at Prague, and that of Doctor of Laws afterwards at Padua. It is not known where he took the degree of Doctor in Medicine. After 1389 we do not hear of him at Prague till 1394, but it was not long before he became celebrated as a "great magister of internal medicine," both through numerous writings on the subject, through cures effected by his skill, and as "professor in ordinary" of the Faculty of Medicine. In 1396 he was body physician to King Wenceslas, whose special favour he afterwards gained by curing him of his severe illness in 1398. Magister Albik was then a married man and had several children, but his wife died soon after the latter date. By his professional skill he amassed a considerable fortune, and became known as a man who set a very high value on money, and it was therefore generally believed, that he had purchased the archbishopric. We may well suppose that, over and above the personal exertions of King Wenceslas

in his favour, such a man as John XXIII. did not allow so valuable a piece of preferment to slip through his fingers without a consideration. It was of little consequence, that the archbishop elect had never turned his thoughts towards the duties and obligations of the priesthood, although in youth he had been ordained to the inferior position of an acolyte, and had thus, by this fourth and lowest of the minor orders, obtained the immunities of the clerical profession. Nor was it till after his appointment to the archbishopric by the pope, that he was ordained sub-deacon (February 27th 1412), after which in June he was ordained to the priesthood. But before the date of the bull, which appointed him, he sold his own house, and took possession of the archiepiscopal palace and estates, being at that time about fifty-four years old.

He was not, however, allowed to enjoy the revenues of his see in luxury and comfort. This was prevented by the religious movement, which kept assuming larger and larger proportions, till, shortly after the new archbishop's accession, manifest storms arose among both clergy and laity. The brief hope of reconciliation, which had been disappointed by Archbishop Zbynek's unconciliatory conduct during the latter part of his life, had given place to greater and greater exasperation against the higher officials of the Church, which exhibited itself with ever-increasing boldness. Hus had now taken up such a position that he had no longer any idea of obeying either archbishop or

pope in matters which appeared to him contrary to God's law, and this resolve daily became stronger and stronger both in himself and in others.

In the beginning of 1412 the usual disputation *de quolibet*, "about what you please," was held in the Carolinum, one of Hus's pronounced adherents, Magister Michael of Malenitz, surnamed Czizek, a Bachelor in Theology, being the "Quodlibetarius," who was bound to maintain certain theses against all comers. During the disputation, it was publicly contended, probably by Magister Jakaubek of Stribro, that the anti-Christ foretold in Scripture was then holding the highest position in the Church, and possessing the highest executive power over the Christian clergy and laity. Thus Pope John XXIII. was clearly indicated as very anti-Christ.

Ere long matters became still worse, owing to general orders of the pope, issued December 2nd, 1411, whereby John XXIII. proclaimed his rival, Gregory XII., and Ladislav, King of Naples, as Gregory's aider and abettor, guilty of heresy, ordered a crusade against Ladislav, and promised plenary indulgences to all who should either take part in the war personally or furnish pecuniary aid towards it. In May, 1412, the pope's legates or commissioners came to Prague, with Wenceslas of Tiem, Dean of Passau, at their head, and after obtaining the consent of the king and archbishop, proceeded to the execution of their duties. The sale of indulgences had been in evil odour at Prague ever since the jubilee in 1393, and there-

fore the archbishop's consistory issued injunctions whereby certain crying abuses were to be kept down on the present occasion. The appraisement of the people at confession was especially prohibited; that is to say, payments, varying according to property or other circumstances, were forbidden to be imposed for indulgences. But the papal commissioner, Tiem, paid little heed thereto, and simply carried on his traffic in God's mercy in the manner best suited to obtain the largest and most certain gains. To make the matter easier, he farmed out entire archdeaconries and deaneries or individual churches to priests, who took the contracts under him, paying him fixed sums and making what they could out of the indulgences afterwards. It was not likely that godly priests would enter into such contracts, and, as a matter of fact, they were undertaken by men notorious for avarice, gambling, concubinage, and the other vices in vogue among the clergy of the day. These men trafficked with the people at confession in the most shameless manner, and perpetrated various disgraceful actions. A broad road was opened for them by the "articles," which Tiem issued as a guide to preachers according to the tenour of the papal bull. In Prague, which he kept under his own superintendence, three churches were appointed for hearing confessions and granting indulgences, *i.e.* the cathedral, the church on the Vyssegrad, and the Church of the Virgin in front of the "Teyn," commonly called the "Teyn"

Church. In each of these was fixed a box or chest, well clamped with iron, as a receptacle for money. That in the cathedral was placed behind the altar of St. Vitus, where the largest number of people was wont to pass.

The sale of indulgences was an abuse against which godly preachers and writers had long exhibited the greatest zeal in Bohemia, considering it the fountain-head of great iniquities. Thus the pope's bull itself, and still more the manner in which it was acted upon, caused great exasperation among the clergy of Hus's party. Hus himself, and others with him, deemed the matter one in which blind obedience ought not to be paid, and consequently determined upon resistance. They first, in an assembly of the university, raised the question whether its members were bound—in accordance with the pope's bull—to contribute pecuniary aid for the crusade against Ladislaw, King of Naples. The Doctors of Theology present, headed by Stephen Palecz, Dean of the Faculty, endeavoured to stop the discussion by arguing, that it did not appertain to them to judge the pope's bulls or resist the king's command, by which they had been approved. Yet Palecz, when Tiem's "articles," containing the rules prescribed to preachers, first came into his hands, had declared, in a conversation with Hus at St. Michael's Parsonage before several witnesses, that they contained "palpable errors," "*errores manu palpabiles.*" But when resistance to them, and thus to the pope's

commands, was in question, Palecz refused assent to the views of Hus, who had hitherto been his friend, and placed himself in a decided attitude of opposition to him, as did also their older and once more daring comrade, Stanislas of Znaym. In Hus's judgment, it was their harsh imprisonment at Bologna that filled them with terror of the papal power, and caused this entire alteration in their views. On the present occasion, the majority of the assembly decided in accordance with the opinion of the doctors.

Hus, however, did not allow himself to be thus diverted from his purpose, but, in the first place, began to preach about the pope's bull, and to set forth his objections to its improper and unworthy tenor. He also wrote and published a special treatise upon the subject. Some days afterwards, he announced a public disputation respecting the bull, to be held in the great hall of the Carolinum on June 7th, and issued invitations to attend it by placards affixed to almost all the church doors in the city, to those of the cathedral and of the church on the Vyssegrad, to the city gates, and other convenient places where large numbers of people were wont to pass. The question proposed by him for discussion was: "Whether, according to Christ's law, it is possible and beneficial, for the honour of God and the salvation of Christian people and for the good of the country, to recommend to Christ's faithful people the pope's bulls respecting the crusade against Ladislaw, King of Naples, and his

confederates?" The Theological Faculty sought to prevent Hus from carrying out his intentions, and commissioned two of its members to go to the archbishop and request him to prohibit the disputation. It was undoubtedly owing to this that Hus was summoned before the archbishop, and that the pope's commissioners were invited to attend at the same time. The legates asked him whether he intended to obey the apostolic commands. He replied that he was willing to do so with his whole heart. But when, pleased at such an answer, they turned to the archbishop and said, "See now, he is willing to obey the commands of our Master!" Hus undeceived them by saying, "Understand me, gentlemen! I term the doctrine of Christ's apostles apostolic commands, and so far as the commands of the Pope of Rome agree with that doctrine and those commands, I am willing to obey them gladly; but when I see the contrary, I shall not obey, even if ye place before me fire to consume my body!" The Faculty of Theology now tried another method. It issued and placarded a prohibition to all its Bachelors, forbidding any of them to argue against the pope's bulls. Hus was a Bachelor of Theology, and thus fell under the prohibition, which, however, he only turned into ridicule, both in the schools and in the pulpit.

The disputation was held on the appointed day, in the presence of a very large audience of magisters, bachelors, and students, both adversaries and

friends of Hus being present. The magisters sat together in order, according to ancient custom, and when Hus had stated his reasons for the position, that it was improper to give money to the pope for the purpose of shedding Christian blood, expressed their various opinions in turn, some in accordance with, and others in opposition to, his views.

After this disputation Hus scarcely ever lost an opportunity of speaking from the pulpit with respect to the pope's indulgences, and of exhorting the people not to pay money for them. He worked also in the same direction by numerous letters sent to various districts and places in Bohemia and Moravia, and also in Poland and Hungary. He even addressed a letter, dated June 10th, to Wladislaw, King of Poland, urging him to endeavour to stamp out simony in his realm. His words had a powerful effect upon the people, so that not only did the revenue derived from the traffic in indulgences suffer great diminution, but a general spirit of resistance to ecclesiastical authority arose. In Prague various excesses took place, whereby the duties of those charged with the execution of the papal bulls were rendered difficult or turned into ridicule. On June 20th there was found in the money-box behind the altar of St. Vitus in the cathedral, a tract against the vendors and defenders of indulgences, in which they were nicknamed Asmodeists, Belialists and Mammonists, and were finally told, that truth-speaking Hus was more to be believed than an assembly of cheating church dignitaries.

On June 24th, Prague was entertained with a satirical procession, got up by Lord Voksa of Waldstein, one of the king's favourites, which was concluded by the public burning of documents with seals representing papal bulls, a more particular account of which will be given in the biography of JEROME OF PRAGUE. This was followed by great excitement among the populace, young men going about from church to church, and giving the lie to preachers who recommended the people to purchase indulgences.

While this was going on at Prague, King Wenceslas was staying at his favourite country seats, Zebrak and Toczniak. Doubtless numerous complaints from the pope's legates and other ecclesiastics reached him there, setting forth the various hindrances and annoyances to which they were subjected. The king, unwilling to put up with such disturbances of public tranquillity, summoned some of the aldermen and principal citizens of Prague to Zebrak about the middle of June, and shortly afterwards a strict prohibition was issued by public proclamation in the name of the king and the magistrates, forbidding any one to speak in opposition to the preachers or the papal bulls.

This, however, was not enough for the opponents of Hus's party. Their aim was nothing less than the extirpation of the tendencies, which had for their end and object the reform of the dominant system among the clergy ; and the weapon, of which they most eagerly availed themselves, was accusa-

tion of heresy. The Faculty of Theology now came to the front, headed by Stephen Palecz and Stanislas of Znaym, who from personal friends of Hus's had suddenly become the deadly enemies of the tendencies in which they had formerly stood shoulder to shoulder with him, and even outstripped him in zeal and energy. It would seem that King Wenceslas himself requested the opinion of the faculty as to the best method of restoring tranquillity thus disturbed by religious discord. The assembly of doctors in the first place required Hus as their subordinate—he being only a bachelor in Theology—to give them a copy of his treatise on the bull relating to indulgences, that they might come to a decision respecting it. Hus refused to give it. The doctors then took as their basis the forty-five articles extracted from the writings of Wycliffe, which had been condemned nine and again four years previously by the university in general, and the Bohemian “nation” in particular, once more declaring which of them were “heretical,” which “erroneous,” and which “scandalous” or “contrary to good morals.” They also framed six other articles relating to late events :

(1) That every one was a heretic, who thought otherwise than the Church of Rome respecting the sacraments and the power of the keys ; (2) That it was an error to teach, that the anti-Christ, who was to come at the end of the world, was existing and reigning in those days ; (3) An error, that the constitutions of the holy fathers and laudable customs ought not to be maintained, because they were not contained in Holy Scripture ; (4) An error, that the relics of the saints ought not to be venerated

by the faithful; (5) An error, that a priest did not absolve ministerially in the sacrament of penance, but merely announced to the penitent confessing that he was absolved; (6) An error, that the pope could not summon the persons of Christ's faithful ones, or ask aid from them for the defence of the holy see and the chastisement of the adversaries and enemies of Christ, by granting to such as faithfully aided, truly repented, confessed and were contrite, full remission of all their sins. A seventh article was added, affirming that the injunction of the king and the citizens, prohibiting any one from clamouring against the preachers or papal bulls, was just, reasonable, and holy.

Both these sets of articles were laid before the king by the Faculty of Theology, with the advice, that the archbishop by the king's command and in concert with the "prelates," the chapter of Prague and the other chapters, and also with the university, should cause their condemnation to be proclaimed anew, in such manner that, whoso should thereafter not behave accordingly, should fall under sentence of excommunication and other penalties, which the king of his good pleasure should annex thereto, in particular that of exile from the realm. They advised also, that certain preachers, from whom disturbances and disputes among the people originated, should be inhibited from preaching. It is self-evident that this was primarily directed against Hus.

If the fragmentary and defective notices extant are understood aright, it would seem that the king summoned the Doctors of Theology on the one hand, and Hus and the magisters of his party on the other, to Zbrak shortly after the beginning of June, in order to make an attempt at bringing about a

reconciliation between them. Both parties met first at the parsonage in the town of Zembrak. There Stephen Palecz read a document composed by himself and Stanislas of Znaym against Hus in the name of the faculty, accusing him of disobedience to the faculty in refusing to give up his treatise; nay, even of disobedience to the king himself, inasmuch as the royal councillors had by royal command ordered the treatise to be delivered to the doctors, and the doctors to give in their opinion respecting it in writing. When the magisters of both parties were summoned before the king's council, and Hus was bidden to deliver his treatise to the doctors, he declared his willingness so to deliver it, provided the doctors would agree with him to a reciprocal wager of death by burning. This terrified them, and they requested permission to go aside for consultation. On returning to the council-room, they declared their willingness to give up one of their number for the purpose, but not to enter into the engagement collectively. To this Hus replied, that if they stood as one man collectively against him, a single individual, they must also accept the penalty of death by burning, whether it were to fall upon himself, the individual, or upon them collectively. But the royal councillors put an end to the altercation by saying to both parties: "Reconcile yourselves handsomely;" and therewith broke up the meeting.

Soon afterwards (July 10th), the articles of the Faculty of Theology were taken into consideration at

Zebrak, in a meeting of certain of the king's councillors appointed for the purpose, which two aldermen and two citizens from each of the three towns of Prague were also summoned to attend. This meeting was held at the house of the king's undertreasurer, Conrad Bishop of Olmütz, in the town of Zebrak, but it is not known what, or whether any, decision was arrived at.

However, on the next Sunday, fresh disturbances took place at Prague, and the preachers recommending the indulgences were again contradicted in their sermons. Three young men, apparently of the artizan class, and probably apprentices living with their masters, named respectively Martin, John, and Stasek, were arrested in three different churches, and brought to the town hall of the Old Town, where the magistrates contemplated dealing severely with them according to the late proclamation. Others, who were found acting similarly in the cathedral were merely hustled, scourged, or cud-gelled by the clerics of the choir.

The fear, that these three young men would pay for their misconduct with their lives, caused great excitement in Prague, and in particular touched John Hus to the quick, as it was the attitude assumed by himself against the indulgences that had been their principal incentive. He therefore, on the following morning (July 11th), betook himself, with a large number of magisters and students, to the town hall, and requested to be admitted into the presence of the aldermen. He must have felt

himself the more strongly urged to this, as the aldermen had very early caused their beadles to give public notice to all people, rich and poor, without exception, to meet in the "ring," or great square, which caused something extraordinary to be anticipated. The assembled aldermen allowed Hus and several magisters to come before them, while the remainder, magisters and students (according to the testimony of an eyewitness, about two thousand in number), remained standing below in front of the town hall. A multitude of other people also assembled, both on account of the public notice, and also because of the unusual concourse of magisters and students. Hus entreated the aldermen not to do anything to the three prisoners, saying that he was himself the cause of the resistance to the indulgences; if, therefore, they were going to do anything to them, let it be done to himself in the first instance. The aldermen, after consultation together, replied, that nothing would happen to the prisoners; Hus and the others might go home with their friends in tranquillity. Calmed by this, Hus departed to his abode, and the rest, after accompanying him thither, dispersed to their own homes.

But the aldermen had been merely making use of deceit in order to carry out their intentions without interruption. As soon as Hus had departed with the magisters and students, they ordered the beadles to give notice to the rest of the people to disperse likewise. When this had partially taken

place, they caused the three prisoners to be led out to execution, surrounded by a large body of armed men. They did not, however, conduct them to the ordinary place of execution under the pillory on the north side of the "ring," but forming a dense circle of armed men round the prisoners at a spot near a house at the corner of "Green Street," there caused them to be beheaded, while a beadle proclaimed: "Whoso commits the same, the same shall be done to him." At these words many of the bystanders, laymen and clergymen, men and women, shouted that the prisoners had been wrongfully beheaded; they too were ready to undergo the same for the same cause. Some of them were actually arrested and led to prison, which caused great murmuring and uproar among the increasing multitude. Finally, a charitable woman stepped forward, and placed three white linen cloths on the ground to cover the corpses, and immediately, under the guidance of a young magister, John of Jiczin, a vast procession of magisters, bachelors, students, and others was formed, the bodies were taken up under the eyes of the aldermen and armed men, and carried devoutly to their burial. Magister Jiczin commenced with a loud voice the anthem, "*Isti sunt sancti*," "They are holy," as usually chanted at commemorations of martyrs, and thus they were borne in a vast crowd of people, high and low, and of both sexes, with loud chanting, and also with much weeping and wailing, to the chapel Bethlehem, where they were interred,

To this religious excitement was attached also, to a certain extent, the incentive of national feeling on the part of the Bohemian against the German population. An old Bohemian annalist, who was an eyewitness, ascribes the excessive severity employed towards the three young men partly to the circumstance that all the aldermen of the Old Town at that time were Germans, as were also the armed men in their service, and complains bitterly of the German inhabitants, many of whom were present and looking on with approving eyes. It is true that there was a German majority in the town council, but the statement that its members were all Germans is not literally true.

The excitement which this cruel execution caused in the population of Prague, evidently surprised and terrified the aldermen. They, therefore, on the morrow (July 12th) sought to get quietly rid of the prisoners arrested on the preceding day. But they were again obliged to have recourse to deceit, because the prisoners, animated by somewhat of the spirit of Paul and Silas at Philippi, refused to be satisfied with their release and take their departure. The beadles were obliged to notify to the prisoners that they were to go before the aldermen for trial, and then, on their leaving the prison at this summons, the prison and town hall were both closed, and they were bidden to depart to their own homes. Some who remained standing in front of the town hall were threatened away with scourges. Through this the populace became em-

boldened. Everywhere the aldermen were spoken against and accused of unrighteously shedding innocent blood ; and for several days some hundreds of people paraded in front of the town hall, shouting that they too were willing to die for the truth. The beadles had plenty of occupation in prohibiting the assembling of crowds in front of the town hall, but the more they made proclamation, the larger were the multitudes that assembled, and if these dispersed for a time, they soon reassembled anew. Not knowing what to do, the aldermen went to the king, and requested orders from him, as they were unable to quiet the disturbance. King Wenceslas flew into a passion, and is reported to have said to them : " Be there a thousand such people, let it be done to them as to the others ; and if ye have not executioners enough in this realm, I will have them fetched from other countries." But the aldermen did not venture to act upon the flighty and passionate expressions of the king.

Anger at the defiant conduct of the people of Prague appears to have finally inclined the king to the advice tendered him by the Faculty of Theology. He summoned a conjoint meeting of the clergy and university, as proposed by the faculty, in order that the articles above mentioned might then and there be condemned. This meeting was held after the fashion of a synod on the next Saturday (July 16th) in the town hall of the Old Town. Several bishops were there (but it is not known whether Archbishop Albik was present or not), many canons,

several abbots, the Prague incumbents, and also the aldermen of the Old Town and perhaps of the other towns of Prague. To strike terror into the excited populace, the town hall was surrounded by a considerable armed force. But the university, which was especially intended to participate in the condemnation of the articles, divided itself into two parts. The Doctors of Theology presented themselves at the town hall and were the chief leaders of the proceedings there, but the majority of the magisters, and with them almost all the bachelors and students, assembled in the Carolinum, where the magisters consulted together under the presidency of the rector, Magister Marek of Königratz. Disapproving alike of a bare condemnation of the forty-five articles extracted from Wycliffe's works, and of a bare assent to the six articles of the Theological Faculty, they sent deputies from their body to the town hall, to summon the members of the university there present to come to the Carolinum, as the appointed place for university business. This duty was undertaken by the rector himself in conjunction with two other magisters, Frederic Epinge and Procop of Pilsen. When the Doctors of Theology and their associates refused to yield to their representations, Magister Marek and his companions protested against the condemnation of the articles in the town hall, so far as it was not demonstrated by proofs from Holy Scripture. The meeting, however, paid no regard to their protest, and passed a resolution, that no one should main-

tain the articles, which had been read before it, under penalty of excommunication, of confiscation of property, and of banishment from the realm.

On the Sunday after (July 17th), a vast congregation assembled at Bethlehem, thirsting to hear what Hus would say in his sermon about the young men who had been executed. He, however, had neither taken part in their solemn funeral, nor did he then say a single word about the event, a thing upon which an evil construction was put, as if, forsooth, the beadles and aldermen had stopped his mouth. Possibly his motive was to avoid further exciting the people, already in far too stormy a temper. Nor was it till the next Sunday, July 24th, that he made any mention of the unfortunate young men, when he spoke in praise of their guiltless death, and exhorted his hearers not to allow themselves by any tortures to be scared away from the truth.

Totally different was the language now held by his former friend, Stephen Palecz. Preaching in the church of St. Gallus, he warned his hearers against the doctrines of Wycliffe, which he had formerly defended. He plainly designated Wycliffe a heretic, and a more dangerous heretic, the more circumspectly he covered and guarded his errors with texts of scripture.

“So delicious,” he said, “are his writings to many, that it is delightful for them to go to death for their sake; even as ye have seen how delightedly and boldly some have bent their necks beneath the sword. And this,” he continued, “is a great

token of heresy ; for amongst us would scarce one, or perhaps not one, be found who would give himself up to death for the truth." And again : " See how timid their faith is ! for they dare not go anywhere with it. For if they went to Rome or elsewhere, and did not recant it, they would be burned as heretics. But we can go anywhere safely with our faith."

Such language exhibits the mean nature of this man, with whom Hus was now no longer on speaking terms. In a last conversation Hus had taken leave of him with the words : " Palecz is a friend, Truth is a friend. Both being friends, it is conscientious to give the preference to Truth."

Hus's uprising against the papal indulgences was such an assault upon the simoniacal system of the day, that it could not but raise a storm against him in the highest ecclesiastical quarter, the court of Rome. His lawsuit with Archbishop Zbynek had there dragged its slow length along till the death of the archbishop. Not long after Cardinal Colonna had issued sentence of excommunication against Hus, the pope transferred the further conduct of the case to certain other cardinals. But when they provisionally allowed Hus's excuses for not appearing personally, he took it again out of their hands and entrusted it to one only of their number, Cardinal Ludovico de Brancatiis, commonly called Cardinal Brancas, who took no steps whatever to bring it to a conclusion, in spite of all the urgency of Hus's procurators.

After the death of Archbishop Zbynek, but in all probability before the final confirmation of his

successor, the dignitaries of the cathedral at Prague caused renewed complaint to be made against Hus through Canon John Cifer and the priest Michael, surnamed "de Causis," from his office of a "procurator de causis fidei." This latter was a man of evil reputation, a German by language, a native of Deutschbrod in Bohemia. In 1399 he was appointed to the incumbency of St. Adalbert in the New Town of Prague, but his spiritual duties were never very near his heart. Having some knowledge of mining, he obtained a commission from King Wenceslas to improve the gold mines of Jilow, and the requisite sum of money was entrusted to him for the purpose. He, however, about 1408, absconded with the money, and betook himself to the papal court, where he appears to have maintained himself by practising as a lawyer. Being retained by the "prelates" of Prague, he presented to Cardinal Brancas a plaint against Hus, in which he audaciously accused him of all the heretical doctrines, which Hus had more than once publicly repudiated, and moreover of disobedience to his ecclesiastical superiors, and of exciting disturbances among the people, petitioning that he might be proclaimed a heretic, deprived of his office of preacher, compelled to recant his errors, and punished according to law.

By the exertions of these new complainants Cardinal Brancas was probably still more hardened against Hus's legal representatives, so that, when they waited upon him with requests that the case

might be brought to a conclusion, he finally forbade them to represent Hus any longer, or to come to him any more, as he had no intention of hearing them again, such being the commands he had received from the pope. As, however, they did not cease their importunities, some of them were imprisoned and part of their property taken from them. Michael de Causis furthermore accused Hus's principal representative, Magister John of Jesenitz, of being a heretic himself, and filed a complaint against him towards the end of 1411, firstly, as a supporter of Hus in his heresy, and secondly, on account of certain theories maintained by him in the hall of the College of Jurisprudence at Prague on September 25th, 1407. At Michael's request the papal "auditor," to whom this complaint was referred, inhibited Jesenitz from leaving Rome until he had satisfactorily cleared himself; nay, by order of the pope himself he was cast into prison in March, 1412. Magister John, however, made his way out of prison during the same month, and escaped from Rome to Bologna. Failing therefore to appear at Rome on the day appointed, he was formally excommunicated on July 29th, 1412. Hus's other procurators also quitted Rome after suffering various humiliations, the whole time of their fruitless residence there having been about a year and a half. Hus's expenses in the conduct of his cause amounted to over 1100 florins, with which, however, he was supplied by some of his wealthier friends.

At the time of the excommunication of John of Jesenitz, news had already arrived at Rome of Hus's resistance to the sale of indulgences, and so had the new plaint of the clergy of Prague against him. These things at length induced the papal curia to bring his case to a conclusion, and that not in a manner favourable to himself. Pope John placed it in the hands of another judge, Cardinal Peter of St. Angelo, who proceeded to final sentence in the course of July. He decreed an "aggravation" of the excommunication issued by Cardinal Colonna in the preceding year, so that the excommunication was to be publicly proclaimed, with a warning to all believers not to hold communication with Hus, publicly or privately, in eating and drinking, in conversation, in buying and selling, in walking about with him, in reception into lodgings, in giving fire and water, and in all and singular good actions, and with a prohibition forbidding any member of his household to attend Divine service. If Hus continued obstinate for twenty days, a renewed aggravation was decreed, so that everybody was also to lie under excommunication who held communication with him in any wise soever, and that in every place, in which Hus should stay, Divine service was to be suspended so long as he should there remain, and one day after his departure. Again, if after this he did not within twenty days submit and apply for absolution, the interdict was to be maintained in all places to which he should go until three days

after his departure ; and after renewed publication of the excommunication, aggravation and re-aggravation in all churches, convents, and chapels, three stones were to be cast at the house in which he resided, in token of everlasting damnation.

This sentence no doubt arrived at Prague some time in August 1412. Hus composed a public protest against it, in which, after the example of Robert Grosstête, Bishop of Lincoln, he APPEALED TO CHRIST, the most righteous Judge, and declared that wrong was being done him, for he had had sufficient excuses for non-appearance before the pope, but had for two years been unable to obtain a hearing for them ; wherefore he declared himself not guilty of contumacy, and unaffected by the pretended and frivolous excommunication.

Meanwhile further steps were taken by the papal court against Hus himself and his friends. Cardinal Peter of St. Angelo had probably already issued his sentence, when news came to Rome respecting the further course of events at Prague after Hus's disputation against indulgences, and in particular respecting the extraordinary proceedings by which the pope's bulls had been turned into ridicule. On the basis of this intelligence Michael de Causis drew up new complaints at the papal court, in which he referred in insulting terms to King Wenceslas himself, and requested that some of the king's favourite courtiers should be personally cited to Rome, and moreover that Hus, as a manifest defender of Wycliffite doctrines, and others who

agreed with him therein, should be without further judicial proceedings proclaimed heretics, and as such be arrested and delivered over to the secular arm ; also that Wycliffe's books should be burned at Rome, and wherever else they should be found. As Hus's associates deserving of punishment, he especially named John of Jesenitz, Zdislaw of Warthenburg, Jacob of Stribro, Procop of Pilsen, and Marek of Königratz. Pope John shrank from harsh measures against King Wenceslas, whose aid he still required against the anti-Pope Gregory, neither did he venture to make a direct attack upon his courtiers, but in all other respects he approved the proposals made to him. A new bull was issued and sent to Bohemia, commanding Hus to be arrested and delivered over either to the archbishop or the Bishop of Litomysl or some other judge to be condemned and burnt ; ordering the chapel Bethlehem to be destroyed and levelled with the ground as a nest of heresy, and the above-named and all other aiders and abettors of Hus to be under excommunication, and if they did not after warning recant within thirty days, requiring them to appear within forty days personally at the court of Rome and answer the plaint of Michael de Causis.

The publication of Hus's excommunication by the pope and these still more violent injunctions caused great excitement among the inhabitants of Prague. When, after expiration of the term of the first aggravation (probably some time in September), Divine service was ordered to be put a stop to

throughout all Prague, with the exception of the Vysehrad, which was protected by the peculiar privileges of its chapter, and when the priests consequently refused either to baptize children or to perform the funeral service over the dead, the part of the population which favoured Hus was still more irritated against them, while another part was angry with Hus and impatient at suffering such tribulation on his account. The German inhabitants began almost universally to behave in a manner hostile to Hus, while the majority of the Bohemians defended him. Some of the king's courtiers behaved defiantly towards the clergy who obeyed the pope, and began to conduct the funeral services over the dead themselves. Hus himself, regardless of the interdict, preached as usual every Sunday at Bethlehem, and so did Nicholas of Miliczin, John Stiekna's successor in the second preachship there. The Germans now formed a conspiracy against Hus, intending to offer their services for the execution of the papal order for his arrest. On October 1st, the anniversary of the consecration of the cathedral, they assembled in armour, with crossbows, partizans and swords, under the leadership of Bernard Chotek, who was in charge of the church of St. Philip and St. James, the parish in which the chapel Bethlehem was situated, and marched to Bethlehem, while Hus was actually delivering a sermon there. But his hearers, though unarmed, boldly confronted their armed adversaries and forced them to retire. Still

attacks directed against Hus continued to be renewed in various ways to such an extent, that he could not but be in fear of his life. Considering also the distress of the people, who felt grievously the deprivation of the sacraments, and were thus becoming dispirited, he finally made up his mind to quit Prague, that the cause of the interdict might be removed. In his own words he "fled, that he might not be to the unrighteous the cause of eternal damnation, and to the righteous a cause of suffering and tribulation, and also that in their madness they might not put a stop to the service of God."

After his departure a meeting was held in the town hall of the Old Town, in which the destruction of Bethlehem according to the pope's command was discussed. This was probably an assembly of the whole community, in which the Bohemians and Germans deliberated apart. The Germans decided for the destruction of the chapel, and were joined therein by some of the Bohemians, one of whom afterwards delivered an address to the Bohemians to that effect. But the majority of the Bohemian citizens expressed itself counter to any such act, which consequently the other party did not venture to undertake by itself.

Party spirit for and against Hus was undoubtedly the cause of various other disturbances and breaches of the peace at Prague. In the university also there was much discord on the subject of religion, which especially exhibited itself at the election of a rector

of the three faculties on St. Gallus' day, 1412, after the conclusion of the rectorship of Marek of Königratz. The Doctors of Theology endeavoured to obtain the election of a partizan of their own, Nicholas Hernetz (Cacabus), a Bachelor of Laws, and finding themselves unable to induce the meeting to adopt their views, withdrew in a body. The meeting then proceeded to elect Magister Christian of Prachatitz, incumbent of St. Michael's in the Old Town, and one of Hus's most faithful friends. After some negotiation the theologians found themselves with no alternative but submission to the will of the majority.

It was not till a little after this election that Magister John of Jesenitz returned to Prague. After his escape from the papal prison at Rome, he betook himself to Bologna and prosecuted his legal studies in that university. His place of residence was apparently unknown at Rome, when he was formally excommunicated there on July 29th. But in September an order came from the pope to the vicar general of the bishop and the authorities of the city of Bologna, to arrest John of Jesenitz, and this order was carried into execution. However, his friends appear to have taken up his case on the basis of the liberties of the university, and to have effected his release from the common prison as a member thereof. They even obtained his promotion to the degree of Doctor of Laws, though, it is said, without the knowledge of the rector and certain others in authority, and with the omission of the

usual ceremonies. In all probability before the papal curia received information of these proceedings, John of Jesenitz secured himself by making his escape to Prague. On December 18th, 1412, under the auspices of the new rector, Christian of Prachatitz, he held a solemn disputation in the college, in which he proved from the laws of the Church, that the excommunication fulminated by the pope against Hus was legally null and void.

CHAPTER VII.

JOHN HUS IN EXILE FROM PRAGUE.

No express information has reached us as to King Wenceslas's immediate feeling with regard to the proclamation of the papal excommunication against Hus and the carrying out of the interdict at Prague, but, from his subsequent behaviour, it would seem that both steps were displeasing to him. His courtiers certainly never ceased to give their aid to the tendencies and aims of Hus, nor did Queen Sophia ever conceal her partiality for them; nay, even after the publication of Hus's excommunication and the aggravation thereof, and also after that of the interdict, she personally attended Hus's sermons at Bethlehem.

After his withdrawal from Prague, Hus betook himself, first, to a very distant district in the south of Bohemia, where a noble of the highest rank, Lord John the elder of Austi, provided him with a safe retreat in a tower named Kozi, not far from his town Austi on the Luznitz, which afterwards

became the celebrated stronghold of the Taborites. It would seem that for some time Hus's place of residence was kept a secret, and that the priests and others, to use his own words, "inquired and conversed as to where he was." He kept up a frequent correspondence thence with Prague, exhorting his former hearers in Bethlehem and the people of Prague in general to steadfastness and constancy in the faith. These letters were probably read aloud in Bethlehem, where Hus left a priest named Havlik (Gallus) as his representative during his absence, probably with the young Magister Martin of Volyne as his assistant, over and above his faithful comrade, the second preacher, Magister Nicholas of Miliezin. Hus also wrote from Kozi to the highest state officials and other lords assembled at the parliament and high court of justice held at Prague in the second half of December, complaining of the persecution to which he was subjected, and entreating them to defend the freedom of the Word of God.

At this court refusal was made to appear and answer a plaint in a lawsuit relating to a freehold inheritance, under the plea that the plaintiff was under the archbishop's excommunication. But the lords, with the approval of the king, overruled the plea, and declared it to be bad in the high court. Neither did Hus's petition remain entirely without effect. The lords took into consideration the question of the removal and extirpation of the baneful cause of discord among the clergy, owing to which

the realm and its inhabitants were grievously troubled in various surrounding countries; and in accordance with a resolution passed by them, King Wenceslas determined that an extraordinary synod of the clergy should be held for the purpose.

Some time previously another change had taken place in the archbishopric of Prague. Magister Albik had soon become weary of this high dignity, involving as it then did such serious cares and difficulties. It was no easy task to steer a middle course, which should avoid giving umbrage either to the king or to the see of Rome. He therefore, in accordance with the simoniacal system of the day, concluded an agreement, by which he resigned the archbishopric in favour of Conrad of Vechta, Bishop of Olmütz, while Conrad gave up his bishopric to Wenceslas of Burenitz, Patriarch of Antioch, the king's high chancellor, who in return resigned the wealthy provostship of the Vyssegrad to Albik. "They made an extraordinary exchange," says the old chronicler, who records the succession of the Bohemian bishops and archbishops; "but, O that that exchange had taken place without the greatest simony!" The sanction of the papal court was necessary for the ratification of such an exchange, and this was not obtained without a considerable cost of time and, no doubt, of money. Nevertheless the holders of these richly endowed positions gave up to each other the charge of their respective benefices by anticipation towards the end of 1412, Conrad designating himself

“governor and administrator of the archbishopric of Prague in spiritualities and temporalities,” and Albik styling himself “administrator of the provostship of the Vyssegrad.”

Conrad of Vechta was a foreigner, a Westphalian, but none the less devoted to King Wenceslas, in whose service he had long been, formerly as Master of the Mint, and at this time as the king's Under-treasurer. No doubt it was not till after the conclusion of the above agreement that he resigned his secular office, to which his personal qualities were much better adapted than to his new ecclesiastical position. At the request of the king and parliament he issued, as administrator of the archdiocese, an order to all prelates, Doctors of Laws, magisters, and other “enlightened men, both secular and regular,” to appear at the projected synod on February 2nd, 1413, at Böhmisch Brod, a town belonging to the archbishop, where the administrator of the archdiocese and the Bishop of Litomysl would be personally present to hear their counsels and come to a determination respecting the requisite measures to be taken. The king also issued a proclamation on the same subject, commanding all whom it concerned to come, and promising them protection and safety on the way.

The reason why this synod was not convened at the archiepiscopal palace at Prague was probably, that the palace was not yet vacated by Albik. But on January 25th he purchased a house in the New Town for himself, his aunt and his two daughters,

and went to reside there at once. Thus the synod came to be actually held, not at Böhmisches Brod, but in the palace on the Kleinseite at Prague.

Meanwhile, shortly after Christmas, 1412, Magister John Hus returned to Prague and began to preach again in Bethlehem, having from the first been disquieted in conscience as to whether he had acted rightly in withdrawing from his duties as preacher on account of his enemies. On the one hand he thought of the words of the Saviour in John x.: "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep; but he that is an hireling and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and the wolf snatcheth and scattereth the sheep;" on the other, of His words in Matt. x.: "When they persecute you in one city, flee into another." He also pondered the counsel of St. Augustine to Honoratus, a bishop who asked his advice under somewhat similar circumstances. Augustine said: "Whoso fleeth in such manner, that the necessary ministry is not wanting to the church through his flight, doth what the Lord hath enjoined or promised. But he who so flees, that the nourishment by which the flock of Christ lives spiritually is taken from it, is the hireling, who sees the wolf coming and fleeth because he careth not for the sheep." Augustine also cited the example of the flight of Athanasius, and expressly laid down the proposition, that if a man were sought for individually (*singulariter*), he might lawfully make his escape. Such is the

statement of the case as given by Hus himself in a letter to his friends Magister Martin and Magister Nicholas of Miliczin.

It was doubtless also Hus's intention to deliberate with his friends at Prague as to the course they should take at the approaching synod. As soon, however, as he began to preach, the clergy of the opposite party put a stop to Divine service. It being now almost time for the synod to meet, the king himself called upon Hus to withdraw. He obeyed and departed for the second time, but not till he had from the pulpit asked and obtained the permission of his congregation. Later, in 1413, recurring to his conduct in this respect, he concluded a letter to Magister Christian of Prachatitz with these words: "I think I sinned in giving up preaching at the king's wish, and therefore I don't wish to sin thus any more."

The hopes entertained by King Wenceslas and the Bohemian lords of obtaining through the synod some reconciliation and *modus vivendi* among the clergy might have been fulfilled, had both the parties, into which it was divided, been animated by a good and honest will in that direction. But the party opposed to Hus had no idea or thought of conciliation. In their sight there could be no reconciliation save by the entire submission of their hated adversaries. In the opinion read before the synod on February 6th, the eight Doctors of Theology espied the fountain of discord only in the disobedience of a portion of the clergy to their superiors,

and in the dissemination of heretical doctrines. The evil repute of the realm could only, according to them, be got rid of by the punishment of those who in their judgment disagreed in belief with the Catholic Church. They therefore requested a renewed condemnation of the forty-five articles extracted from the writings of Wycliffe, the acceptance of the six articles set forth by themselves in the preceding year, and the recognition of the validity of the papal excommunication issued against Hus. They also proposed :

(1) That all doctors and magisters of the university should be summoned to the archbishop's palace, and that each should then and there make oath before the archbishop and the other "prelates," that he doth not and will not hold any of the long prohibited forty-five articles ; and that with regard to the sacraments, to the rules and laws of the Church, to indulgences, to the honouring of the relics of the saints and other matters, he believes and will believe as doth the Church of Rome, the head whereof is the pope and the body the cardinals ; and that obedience ought to be paid to the authorities of the Church in everything, unless pure good be forbidden or pure evil commanded by them ; (2) That all members of the university should be forbidden to act in contravention thereof under pain of excommunication and banishment ; that this prohibition should be proclaimed at synods and in sermons ; and whoever should offend against it should be punished by his diocesan, that no one might venture "to preach or dogmatize of his own head as hath already been done ;" that the singing of scandalous and libellous songs in the streets, in taverns and elsewhere, should be prohibited ; and finally that Magister John Hus should not preach, until he had obtained absolution from the papal curia, neither should he by open or secret presence prevent the performance of Divine service at Prague.

Hus and his friends at once denied the proposition, which formed the basis of this opinion of the doctors, viz., “that the dissemination of heretical doctrines had been the cause of discord;” and grounded their denial upon the fact, that none of them had yet been convicted of heresy, neither had the forty-five articles from Wycliffe’s writings been condemned by higher authority than the isolated and local assemblies to which the doctors appealed. They affirmed, that the true and universally acknowledged cause of discord was evangelical preaching, in which rebukes were administered—(1) to Simonists, the chief of heretics, who flourished especially at the court of Rome, and thence spread their branches throughout the world; (2) to manifest adulterers and concubinists; and (3) to the covetous and proud, who were lording it in secular fashion among the clergy.

When the magisters of Hus’s party, who formed the majority in the university, consulted together as to the suggestions which they were to make to the synod, Magister Jakaubek of Stribro (Jacobellus) laid his opinion before them, to this effect:

“That there were two kinds of peace and concord, one according to the world, the other according to Christ. That, in order that peace in Christ, which consisted in the observance of His law, should be restored, it was necessary that the king, with the rest of the inhabitants of the land, should exert themselves to put down the simoniacal heresy, to put a stop to licentiousness, adultery, and concubinage, and to superabundance of temporalities and secular dominion among the clergy. That, inasmuch as Hus and his adherents strove and endeavoured to introduce

this evangelical order into the realm, but many of the clergy, blinded by maliciousness, opposed them, Hus and his adherents should be cited to answer the complaints against them, and purge themselves from calumny. If worldly peace could not thus be attained, let people be satisfied with peace according to the law of Christ; for calumny and accusations of heresy would do no harm to the realm of Bohemia."

The assembled magisters, having in all probability come to an understanding with Magister John Hus, did not accept these suggestions in their letter, but adopted others resting upon the same basis, which were also read before the synod. The magisters requested :

"That the late decision of the king's privy councillors in their arbitration between Archbishop Zbynek and the party of Hus should be observed as just and convenient; and that, as Archbishop Zbynek had not then brought any charge against Hus, Hus should be allowed to appear before the synod, and whoever wished to accuse him of any error or heresy should there do so under engagement to undergo an equal penalty, should he fail to prove his accusation. That, if no one did this, proclamation should be made by the king's command in all the towns, and likewise by order of the bishop by all incumbents, that Hus was ready to answer for his belief, and that whoever wished to come forward publicly against him, was to notify the same with his name in the archbishop's chancery. That if no one appeared for this purpose, those who were making denunciations at the papal court, that in the realm of Bohemia and margravate of Moravia the hearts of many were infected with heresy or error, should be summoned, should be required to prove their statements, and if they failed to do so, should be punished. That all the Doctors of Theology and Ecclesiastical Law should be asked separately and apart, if they knew any heretic or maintainer of error, to name him; and if they knew none such, should make acknowledgment thereof before the public notaries and under seal. That, this

being done, the king and the archbishop should prohibit under a penalty any one to designate another a heretic, unless he were willing to prove it; and that the king with the lords should then send a fitting embassy to the court of Rome, taking a collection from the clergy for the expenses, to purge the realm from the accusation of heresy; and that those, who maligned the realm at the papal court, should also go with the embassy at their own expense. And finally, that the interdict should not be again proclaimed on account of the presence of Hus or his preaching in Prague."

Of the superior authorities of the Church in Bohemia, who were, according to King Wenceslas's wish, to have presided together over this synod, only one, Conrad, the administrator of the archbishopric, occupied the presidential chair, the other, Bishop John of Litomysl, being expected later. Both the above opinions were sent to him at Litomysl for consideration, and he gave his judgment upon them in writing on February 10th. He decidedly rejected the suggestions of the magisters of Hus's party and approved those of the doctors; yea, annexed to them advice still sharper in some respects, suggesting that a vice-chancellor should be appointed in the university to inquire into and correct the errors of magisters and students; that Hus and his "accomplices" should cease and be prohibited from preaching, and should be forbidden to enter Bethlehem; and that all Bohemian books should be prohibited, by which Hus and his "accomplices" sought to disseminate their errors among the laity.

Unfortunately no intelligence has come down

to us of the further course of the synod, and thus much only is certain, that it did not lead to renewal of concord between the parties. It is certain too, that Bishop John did not go later to the synod, being detained by urgent cares of his own, and it is probable that the Administrator Conrad did not venture to come to a decision on the basis of counsels so diametrically opposed to each other.

Hus's enemies now, to their joy, received welcome intelligence from Rome, where, simultaneously with the synod at Prague, an assembly of the Roman clergy was convoked by Pope John XXIII., and designated by him a "general council," in which, on February 2nd, all Wycliffe's writings were, without exception, condemned, and ordered, although containing some truth, to be universally burned, as injurious to the faithful; and all of them that could be collected at Rome were actually burnt in front of St. Peter's. This intelligence arrived shortly after the conclusion of the Prague synod in a letter from "Olenus, procurator of causes in the Roman curia," to "the Honourable Doctor of Decrees, Dominus George Bora, in Prague."

But this joy was ere long greatly overclouded from another quarter. The unconciliatory and passionate behaviour of Hus's adversaries at a synod, which was, according to King Wenceslas's earnest desire, to have led to a reconciliation, caused an alteration unfavourable to them in the mind of the king. Hus's party pointed to the fact, that the basis of the Doctors of Theology, that part

of the Bohemian clergy were devoted to heretical doctrines, could not possibly conduce to peace, but contained a repetition of the charge of heresy brought against the realm, which it was just King Wenceslas's object to refute. Doubtless the king's courtiers, who were favourable to Hus, did not omit to draw his attention to this, and the king began in consequence to incline more decidedly to Hus's side. When the synod failed as a means of quieting the dissensions among the clergy, the king determined to avail himself of another mode of attaining the desired end, and shortly after Easter (April 23rd), appointed a special commission to engage in the task. The commissioners were Archbishop Albik, whose resignation had not yet been confirmed by the pope; Magister Zdenek, of Labaun, ⁵Provost of All Saints; Jacob, Dean of the Vyssegrad, and Hus's friend, Magister Christian of Prachatitz, then rector of the university. Zdenek and Dean Jacob were members of the king's privy council, and were, therefore, expected to shape their course in accordance with the king's wishes, and the same expectations were entertained with regard to Archbishop Albik.

The royal commissioners summoned before them on the one hand four prominent Doctors of Theology, Peter of Znaym, John Elias, Stanislas of Znaym, and Stephen Palecz; and on the other, John of Jesenitz, Hus's procurator; Magister Jakaubek of Stribro, and Magister Simon of Tisnow. The conference took place on a Friday at Magister

Christian's residence, the parsonage of St. Michael's. Here, after some conversation, Magister Zdenek inquired of both parties in the name of the commissioners, whether they were willing to abide by the decrees and decisions of the Roman Church with regard to the sacraments and all other matters whatever relating to the Church and the Catholic faith. The Doctors of Theology replied in the affirmative, but with the addition, that they meant by the Roman Church, that Church whose head was the pope and whose body was the college of cardinals. On the other side, John of Jesenitz gave in an answer in writing :

(1) That they stood and abode by the convention made by the king's councillors in the preceding year ; (2) That they admitted themselves to be, as a party, opposed to the chapter of Prague and the doctors, prelates, and other clerics adhering to them in the inconsiderate burning of Wycliffe's books, in the arrogant condemnation of the forty-five mutilated articles, and in the slanderous writings given in at the late synod, in which it was asserted that there were clergy in Bohemia entertaining evil sentiments with regard to the seven sacraments and the keys of the Church ; (3) That they were and intended to be obedient to the decrees and decisions of the Roman Catholic Church, whose head is Christ and the pope his vicgerent, in all wherein faithful Christians ought to abide and be obedient ; and (4) That with regard to all personal disputes they submitted to the decision of the commissioners under such penalties as they should appoint.

After hearing these declarations the royal commissioners gave sentence, notifying it to the parties by the mouth of Zdenek : That, whereas it was found, that both parties were agreed as regards

obedience to the Catholic Church in all wherein faithful Christians ought to be obedient, they were, therefore, in accord therein; wherefore neither party was to condemn the other; and they were all to make acknowledgment to this effect before the king, the archbishop and the lords, or wherever else the question might be put to them. In the next place, as regards matters of personal dispute, they were to give them in in writing the next day, and the commissioners would seek to bring them to agreement with regard to them. The doctors raised their voices at once against the first portion of this decision, and refused to abide by it; but, as regards personal disputes, they could not stand out, but promised to submit, as well as the other party, under penalty of one thousand kops of groshen, and banishment from the realm.

On the morrow, Saturday, the commissioners inquired of both parties whether they would abide by the engagements made the day before. The Doctors of Theology again resisted the statement, that they were at one with the other party in their view of obedience to the Roman Church, requesting the omission of the words "wherein faithful Christians ought to obey," and the re-discussion in detail of the forty-five articles and the other matters brought forward at the late synod. The commissioners, whose only business it was to fulfil the king's wishes by quieting the strife, reproached the doctors for their obstinacy, and told them that they should inform the king that Hus's party

had complied with everything, whereas they (the doctors) refused to accept their decision; they would, however, find out that within a week it would fall on their own heads. With this all negotiation was broken off, and the four doctors immediately took their departure from Prague for fear of the king's anger, and sent written advice to the other magisters of their party to avoid further negotiation, and either, like them, to depart or to conceal themselves.

The threat of the royal commissioners did not wait long for its fulfilment. King Wenceslas issued an edict banishing the four doctors aforesaid, as the authors of dissension, from the realm of Bohemia and the lands thereto appertaining, and commanding their expulsion from the university, and the nomination of others to fill their places, both in the college and in their canonries and prebends at All Saints. Proclamation was to be made thereof in the college and elsewhere, and all who opposed the unity and reconciliation, which it was the duty of the commissioners to bring about, were to be similarly punished by exile and deprivation. The king's command was carried into execution without resistance, and it appears that Magisters Christian of Prachatitz, Simon of Tisnow, Simon of Rokycany, and Antonin of Launy, succeeded to the positions of the four doctors in the Emperor Charles's college and in the chapter of All Saints.

Magister John Hus returned to Prague after the conclusion of the synod and resided there without

let or hindrance till after Easter. The priests of the opposite party did not suspend Divine service on account of his presence, although they were aware of it, until he recommenced preaching in Bethlehem. When, however, the royal commission commenced its work of endeavouring to reconcile the parties, Hus again quitted Prague, no doubt at the king's wish, and was not there when the four doctors went into exile. He betook himself again to the tower or castle of Kozi, where he allowed nothing to hinder him from preaching, a duty the temporary omission of which he considered a sin. He not only preached at Kozi, whither large numbers of people congregated from the neighbouring country, especially from the town of Austí, to hear him, but began to travel also far and wide from castle to castle, from town to town, from village to village. Where he was unable to preach in the churches, he preached in the open fields, in woods, on the highways, and among the hedges, appealing for his justification to the example of the Saviour. He especially sought out occasions at which large numbers congregated, as church-wakes or weddings, and was everywhere followed by multitudes on foot, on horseback and in carriages.

The proceedings at and connected with the synod of Prague caused further polemical controversy between the more prominent members of the parties, and the dispute was conducted on both sides with no small amount of acrimony. In the first place, Hus himself and his zealous ally, John of Jesenitz,

respectively wrote replies to the "conditions of concord" handed in at the synod by the eight Doctors of Theology. Stanislas and Palecz rejoined in two pamphlets shortly after their flight from Prague, in which they also assailed the declaration made by their adversaries before the commission at St. Michael's parsonage. These writings induced Hus to compose a more extensive treatise "on the Church" ("De Ecclesia"), whereof more hereafter, in which he especially propounded his views as to the power and authority of the pope. This treatise was undoubtedly written at Kozi, but sent thence to Prague for publication and circulation, and was for that purpose dictated at Bethlehem to several copyists at once, who finished their work on July 8th, 1413. Hus afterwards composed separate answers to the two pamphlets of Stanislas and Palecz. The disputes of the learned soon passed into a wider sphere among their respective adherents, who began reciprocally to annoy each other in various ways, especially by bandying nicknames. Hus's adherents were designated "Wycliffites," or—from the Christian name of both the English and Bohemian leaders—"Johannites." These again retorted upon their adversaries by the nickname of "Mahometists," thus reproaching them for their violent proceedings in order to attain their ends. "It was Mahomet," said Jacobellus, "not Christ, who taught this law, viz. to persecute and slay."

Hus's literary activity did not however confine itself to these learned controversies, which were

throughout conducted in Latin, but turned itself simultaneously to matters of more general interest. His distance from Prague provided him with more leisure than he had hitherto enjoyed, and he therefore began from the commencement of his residence at Kozi to compose writings in the Bohemian language, by which he made a way for his teaching among all classes of the population. Such were the "Bohemian books," the prohibition of which was proposed, as above mentioned, by the Bishop of Litomysl. Besides other lesser writings, Hus had before November 11th, 1412, completed his comprehensive exposition of the creed, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer, wherein he dealt in a similar spirit to that of Thomas of Stitny in the preceding century with the principal portions of Christian faith and morality. Hus did not attain to the depth of thought or purity of language of his great predecessor, but his plainer and simpler style made his writings more intelligible to the common people. By February 2nd, 1413, he had finished his work "On Simony," which was an unreserved description, without respect of persons, of the faults and failings of the clergy, and of all the corruption existing at the day in ecclesiastical government, entering into much greater detail than Mathias of Janow had done, yet never overstepping the limits of truth. During the further course of 1413, Hus's principal employment was the composition of his "Postilla," or expositions of all the Sunday and Saint's-day Gospels of the

ecclesiastical year, which was completed at Kozi on October 28th.

Not only in his work on Simony, but more or less in all his writings, did Hus castigate the abuses dominant among the clergy, interweaving also bitter reflections on the events of the day. Yet never did he reject any article of the creed, any sacrament, any ceremony or custom generally received in the Church, though he never ceased from warfare against gross errors in their acceptance. The fundamental difference between him and his opponents in matters of faith was touching the limits of the power and authority of the pope, the existence of which is admitted by the latest decree respecting papal infallibility. Hus's adversaries hardly admitted any such limits, taking as they did for their basis the definition, that "the Church is the pope with the cardinals," or, as commonly expressed, "the Church is that of which the pope is the head and the cardinals the body." To this Hus in his treatise "On the Church" opposed the counter-definition, that "the Church is the collective body of those predestined to salvation." The definition of Hus's antagonists was practical enough, and intended to require absolute obedience to be paid to the pope, "unless pure good were prohibited or pure evil commanded by him." It did not, however, provide for the very possible contingency of a dispute between the pope and cardinals, in which case the head and body of the Church would have been at variance. Nor was it

so very long before ridicule was cast upon the whole idea of this definition by the body proceeding to decapitate itself at Constance. Hus's definition on the other hand was of an utterly unpractical nature, especially as he did not draw any clear distinction between the visible and invisible Church, to the latter of which alone his definition is applicable. But he maintained reasonably enough, that what the pope commanded must not be at variance with the law of Christ, and therefore with Holy Scripture, since the sole Head of the entire Church militant, dormant and triumphant, is Christ Himself, the pope being only His vicegerent in the Church militant. No decision had at that time been come to by authority as to the definition of the Church, which might therefore to a great extent have been looked upon as an open question.

In assuming Holy Scripture as the infallible and most certain fountain of Christian doctrine, Hus did not mean to assert, that the tradition of the Catholic Church was essentially at variance with Scripture, and that therefore the doctrinal system relating to the creed and ordinances of Christianity required to be reviewed in detail and recast upon the basis of Scripture. He was always far removed from any such notion, nor did he ever exhibit the slightest tendency to diverge from the teaching of the Church through research into Holy Scripture. It was not his aim to introduce doctrinal or liturgical novelties, but never did he lose from sight the reform of the existing condition of Church govern-

ment, and the subversion of the simoniacal system under which it was carried on. In considering the means by which this end was to be obtained, the first and foremost object of his wishes was a pope who would come forward as a true and authoritative reformer. Entertaining, however, but slender hopes of such a person being elected to such a position, he thought it good that secular princes and lords should rise up against the abominable traffic in spiritual offices; yea, that they should take the superabundant endowments of spiritual persons, which he considered to be the fountain head of the entire pestilence, into their own hands, and give the priests a modest competence out of them. And finally, he concluded that ordinary people should also take up a position counter to open simonists and ill-living clergymen by withholding their maintenance from them, and that *pro tempore* they should cease to dread citations and excommunications, which he looked upon as the weapons with which the clergy defended their wickedness. In enunciating such principles, and more and more plainly urging the laity to act upon them, Hus (says Tomck) was undoubtedly treading upon what we should call revolutionary ground; but these views originated in him from the persuasion that under certain circumstances it was a matter of duty to obey God rather than man, and the longer he defended them, the more zealous did he grow in their defence; yea, the more and more did he become confirmed in his resolution to risk his life for them.

Thus much it is requisite to state at once with regard to Hus's principal writings, in order that his position, both as a Church-reformer and as an individual, both in his own country and in the ecclesiastical world in general, may be properly understood, before we accompany him on his final journey to Constance. The man himself will afterwards stand revealed before us in a selection from his own writings and letters, especially those in his native language, in which he speaks heart to heart to his own countrymen. Never was reformer more unselfish, never did a man more completely lose—or rather abandon—his own individuality in the great end and object to which he devoted his life.

But to return to the course of events. It was not till June 17th, 1413, that Bishop Conrad, after finally obtaining his confirmation as archbishop from Pope John, was solemnly inducted into the archiepiscopal see of Prague. The arrangements made respecting the exchange of the bishopric of Olmütz and the provostship of the Vyssegrad, were also confirmed, Magister Albik receiving the honorary title of Archbishop of Cæsarea.

On the day of the exhibition of the relics at Prague, April 20th, 1414, Hus again quitted his refuge at Kozi, and returned to Prague, where he took up his residence at Bethlehem, but does not appear to have preached publicly. Although the priests, and in particular the archbishop, were aware of his presence, yet Divine service was not on this occasion suspended, doubtless in order to

avoid disturbances among the populace. During his stay at Prague, Hus composed his little treatise, "On Six Errors," in which he criticized faulty notions respecting the power of the priesthood, the wicked employment of excommunication, and the dominant system of simony. He caused the entire treatise to be inscribed on the inner walls of the chapel, in order to draw the continuous attention of the people to the subject. This work being completed on June 6th, he returned, in all probability, shortly afterwards to Kozi, where, however, apparently just about this time his friend and protector, John the elder, died, and John's brother Ulric, whose views were unfavourable to Hus, became the guardian of his children. This is probably the reason why we find Hus residing in the town of Austí, whence, on June 26th, he dated another little treatise, intituled "The Kernel of Christian Doctrine." Soon afterwards he quitted the district, and betook himself to the castle of Krakovetz, near Rakovnik, whither he was invited by another noble friend, high in office at the king's court, Lord Henry Lefl of Lazany. It would seem that he travelled to Krakovetz by Prague, where he stayed a few days, and recommenced his journey on July 15th. At Krakovetz he composed a pamphlet against a priest, who had become a nobleman's clerk of the kitchen, and who had asserted that Hus had been expelled from another district; *i.e.* from the neighbourhood of Austí. This Hus denies in the words :

“The priest, who is a clerk of the kitchen, must be informed, that they feel the want of me greatly in that district, in which I preached in towns, villages, and fields, in castles, and under castles, and in a wood under a linden-tree by the castle called Kozi. And having proclaimed the Word of God to them, I have betaken myself to another district to proclaim the truth there also. And afterwards, if God permit, I shall go into another district.”

There is no doubt that Hus is perfectly correct in his statements as to the feelings of the *people* in Austi and its neighbourhood, but the priestly clerk of the kitchen had also something to say in defence of his assertion, considering the sentiments of the new master of Kozi.

Meanwhile adversaries arose against Hus in foreign and distant lands. His fame had by this time spread throughout Christendom, and brought into the field against him, amongst others, no less a person than the distinguished French theologian, JOHN GERSON, chancellor of the University of Paris, who, though recognizing the need of reform in the Church, especially in the discipline of the clergy, was nevertheless a passionate defender of rigid authority, and of the supremacy of the Church over temporal rulers and nations. The tendency in Bohemia to resist ecclesiastical authority excited his displeasure, and he therefore wrote on May 17th, 1414, to Conrad, Archbishop of Prague, setting forth the danger of Wycliffe's doctrines, and “how difficult, yea impossible,” it was to correct and reduce to order their disseminators “by reasoning or authority, because they feared neither to deny

nor oppose the principles of Divine law and apostolic authority, by which they ought to regulate their conduct." He therefore urged Conrad for this purpose to seek the aid of King Wenceslas, and, if requisite, endeavour to constrain him thereto by means of excommunication and other punishments ordained by spiritual and temporal law against rulers who paid no regard to the extirpation of heresy. Later, after copies of some of Hus's writings had been placed in his hands, he extracted, particularly from the treatise "On the Church," various propositions, either explicitly or implicitly (*formaliter aut elicitivé*) therein contained, and sent them to Archbishop Conrad as erroneous. He also wrote him a second letter (September 24th), representing the danger of such principles to all power, whether spiritual or temporal, reiterating that both powers ought to arise and extirpate them by fire and sword, rather than by careful or "curious" reasoning.

Archbishop Conrad (September 2nd) returned a courteous answer to Gerson's first letter, thanking him for his attention, and declaring his own readiness to do his utmost to extirpate error, even if he had to risk his life in so doing. But such language could scarcely have come from his heart, knowing as he did the sentiments of Wenceslas far better than the Chancellor of Paris, and intending, as far as possible, to shape his course thereby. Application was also made to King Wenceslas by Pope John, who wrote to him from Bologna (June 17th),

again complaining that the Wycliffite heresy, which had been condemned by what he termed a "general council" at Rome, was increasing in the countries under Wenceslas's rule, and that disobedience towards the papal see, and disregard for ecclesiastical penalties, were publicly preached; expressing, moreover, his confidence that the king, as protector of the Church, would exert all his power to root out that plague for the preservation of the honour and good estate of his realm.

When Pope John sent this letter, he had been more than a year non-resident at Rome, owing to its capture by his mortal foe, Ladislaw of Naples, on May 31st, 1413. The blow thus inflicted upon him induced him after long refusal eventually to assent to the wish for the convocation of a real "general council" according to the resolutions of the council of Pisa. Moreover, at the instance of Sigismund, King of the Romans and of Hungary, who had marched into Italy, partly to his assistance and partly on account of the war between Hungary and Venice, he also agreed (December 9th, 1413), that the council should be held in a German city, CONSTANCE, in Swabia. The opening of the council was appointed for November 1st, 1414. After a personal interview with the pope at Lodi at the end of 1413, in which no doubt the condition of Bohemia was discussed, Sigismund began to interest himself in the matter of Hus, and hit upon the idea of inducing Hus, who refused to appear for trial at Rome, or before the

papal curia, to appear before the council to justify himself with regard to his orthodoxy, a plan which Sigismund intended to provide him with full and free opportunity of carrying into execution. While staying at Friuli some time in the spring of 1414, Sigismund requested two Bohemian nobles attached to the court of Wenceslas, who were with him either on some embassy or possibly assisting him in his war against Venice, Lord Wenceslas of Duba and Lestno, and Lord John of Chlum, surnamed Kepka, to discuss the subject with Hus on their return to Bohemia. Later, he also made use of the services of Lord Henry Leff, with whom Hus was residing at Krakovetz, and likewise of those of Lord Nicholas Divoky of Jemniste. These were all favourers of Hus and his party.

These negotiations were probably the cause that Hus, after a brief stay at Krakovetz, journeyed thence to Prague (August 6th), attended by a numerous escort of gentlemen and others, intending, no doubt, to consult his friends with regard thereto. King Sigismund's intention, as signified to Hus by the noblemen commissioned to communicate with him, was not only to give him a safe conduct on his way to Constance, but also to procure him a free and safe public hearing in the council, in such manner indeed, that if he were unwilling to submit to the judgment of the council, he was to have a free and safe journey back to his own country. Such is Hus's own statement in a letter written after June 5th, 1415, and also

in an earlier, but undated letter, in which he expressed a wish that he could but once at any rate speak with the king, since he had come thither at his wish and under his promise that he should return safe to Bohemia. Nor is there any reason to doubt that such inducements were actually held out to him by Sigismund. Whether the king were exceeding his powers or not in promising a safe return to Bohemia, should Hus decline to submit to the judgment of the council, is another question; but it is impossible not to suspect that Sigismund promised more than he knew he could perform, in hope that the chapter of accidents would eventually relieve him of trouble and responsibility. There were not wanting people among Hus's friends and favourers, who knew Sigismund well, and warned Hus at once against trusting his safe conduct. "He will deliver thee to thine enemies himself," they told him; nay, Lord Nicholas Divoky said to him in a confidential conversation in the presence of Magister John of Jesenitz: "Magister! know for certain that thou wilt be condemned." "I think," writes Hus in the letter first above quoted, "he knew the king's intention. I thought that God's law and the truth had a savour for him; now I understand that they savour to him not much; he condemned me before my enemies did so." Probably Hus partly entertained a certain belief in Sigismund's honour and honesty and expressed intention "to bring his cause to a satisfactory conclusion," and partly had made up

his mind too firmly to be diverted from his purpose by any personal considerations. He desired to make use of the assistance proffered him by Sigismund to make an attempt to gain a victory for his views in the council, and should it be unsuccessful, he had no wish to elude the danger that threatened his life. He therefore, some time in August, replied in writing to King Sigismund, that he intended humbly to risk his life and appear under the protection of his majesty's safe conduct at the approaching council of Constance.

Meanwhile the last-mentioned letter of Pope John to King Wenceslas, urging him to extirpate heresy, had arrived at Prague. Hus, on hearing of it, sought to pacify the king by taking a short and ready method of extricating himself from ill-repute. On August 27th there was to be an extraordinary synod at Prague on account of some business between the king and the clergy. On the day preceding Hus caused notices to be placarded in Latin, Bohemian, and German, at the cathedral and other churches in Prague, at all colleges, on the gates of the king's and archbishop's palaces and elsewhere, sent them about to other towns, and caused them to be read aloud at sermons, inviting every one, who desired to accuse him of obstinate persistence in error or heresy, to bind himself to prove the same under penalty of a like punishment should he fail to do so; for he (Hus) was willing to appear before the archbishops and prelates and answer every one with regard to his

faith, and if convicted, to suffer as a man in error or a heretic ; and was willing similarly to appear at Constance before the pope and the general council.

When the synod was opened in the archbishop's palace on the Kleinseite, Magister John of Jesenitz came as Hus's representative in front of the palace with a notary and witnesses, knocked at the door, and requested that either Hus in person or himself as his representative should be admitted into the assembly before the archbishop, the prelates, and the rest of the clergy, with the intent and purpose notified in the placards. The archbishop's marshal came out and informed the magister that at that time, and so long as the assembly was treating of the king's matters, he could not be admitted, but he might wait outside and return when the business was ended. Magister Jesenitz waited for some time requesting admission, and when he found himself unable to obtain it, caused a declaration to that effect to be drawn up and signed by the witnesses.

No one came forward in answer to Hus's placards, and he therefore placarded another notification on the gates of the king's palace in the Old Town, addressed to the king, the queen, the high steward, and all the king's court, requesting them to bear him witness, that he had presented himself to answer any one who wished to accuse him, but nobody had entered into the required engagement with him ; and announcing anew that he intended

to appear before the general council at Constance, and did not refuse to suffer as a heretic, should any heresy be proved against him. He also wrote to King Sigismund on September 1st, sending him copies of his placards, and requesting him, according to promise, to grant him a safe conduct to Constance and obtain him a safe and public hearing; for he hoped without fear "to confess the Lord Christ, and, if requisite, suffer death for His most righteous law."

Hus then adopted another mode of obtaining evidence to show that no heresy had yet been proved against him. His authorized representative, Magister John of Jesenitz, appeared on August 30th at the house of the royal master of the mint, Peter Zmerzlik of Svojsin, before Nicholas, Bishop of Nazareth, inquisitor of heresy in the diocese of Prague, and inquired whether he was aware of any error or heresy in Magister John Hus. The bishop replied before witnesses, "that he had frequently associated with Magister John Hus, eating and drinking with him, had often been present at his sermons, and had had many conversations with him on divers matters of Holy Scripture, but had never found any error or heresy in him, but in all his words and deeds had found him an orthodox and Catholic man." Magister Jesenitz again inquired whether any one had ever accused Hus of error or heresy before him, as inquisitor appointed by the papal see. The bishop replied that this had never been done by any one,

although Hus had at that time issued notifications for the purpose by placards throughout the whole city. In addition to the testimony signed by the witnesses, the bishop gave Hus a letter patent under his own seal in the words above cited.

Hus's adversaries did not come forward publicly against him, as they were invited by him to do, but conspired against him the more in secret, as soon as they learned his intention of appearing before the council. They commenced their preparations to destroy him there by collecting witnesses against him, and taking their evidence, in order to be able to accuse him of heresy. Again, as in 1409 before the late archbishop at Prague, the first among these witnesses was John Protiva, incumbent of St. Clement's at Poritz, and formerly preacher at Bethlehem, and with him Magister Andrew of Brod, one of the eight Doctors of Theology and a Canon of Prague. The principal tenour of their evidence was, that Hus taught that the substance of bread remained in the sacrament after consecration, and that a priest in sin did not absolve. These things they brought against him, partly from private conversations held several years ago at St. Michael's parsonage and in the house of Wenceslas the cupmaker, and also at a friendly visit which Hus made to Andrew of Brod in his room in the Carolinum in the presence of two other magisters; and partly from Hus's public sermons, in which they caught phrases, to which they gave a different turn, and which they applied in a different

sense. They also accused him of exciting disturbances between the Bohemians and Germans, referring not only to his action as to the three votes of the Bohemian "nation" in 1409, but also to his sermon in 1400, at the time of the siege of Prague by the Margraves of Meissen. Andrew of Brod was not ashamed to accuse Hus of his exertions with respect to the three votes, although he had himself stood shoulder to shoulder with him, when that matter was in question.

Hus, who had meanwhile returned from Prague to Krakovetz, not only received information of the plots of his adversaries, but also obtained copies of the statements of all the witnesses, with their names. Not desiring to remain in evil repute upon false grounds, especially if he were to lose his life at Constance, the possibility of which he never concealed from himself for a moment, he wrote notes and interlineations, proving the charges to be false, and again, as ever, repudiated the opinions which were now ascribed to him anew. It was his wish that the statements of the witnesses, with his replies, should be read aloud after his departure "to all faithful and beloved brethren in the Lord Jesus, who had heard or received the Word of God through him," as well as a farewell letter which he sent them (October 10th), in order that, knowing his opinions, they might not be dispirited if he were condemned for any imputed heresy.

As regards the accusation relating to the assignment of three votes to the Bohemian "nation"

against the one left to the Germans, Hus requested the rector and council of the university to give him for his defence a copy of King Wenceslas's charter (*privilegium*), and of the university's own decree, from the statute book, and likewise a copy of the resolution of the university protesting against Archbishop Zbynek's burning of Wycliffe's books. Although no safe conduct had yet reached him from Sigismund, Hus resolved to start without it, and made all needful preparations for the journey. The escort of the three commissioners appointed by King Wenceslas to travel with him was provisionally to secure his safety on the way to Constance. These were the same two noblemen who had originally negotiated with Hus on behalf of King Sigismund, Lord Wenceslas of Duba and Lestno, and the Knight John of Chlum; and, thirdly, a relative of the last mentioned, Lord Henry of Chlum and Lacembok.

As meanwhile, during the usual session of the high court of justice at the Ember days preceding Michaelmas, a parliament of the estates was held at Prague, Hus wrote a letter to the lords there assembled, petitioning them to inquire of Archbishop Conrad, who was also present, whether he was aware of any error or heresy in him, because he was willing to clear himself of it in the realm beforehand, or suffer punishment if he failed to do so; and if the archbishop was not aware of any such thing, requesting him to give his testimony to that effect. The lords put the question to the arch-

bishop, who replied orally, that he was not aware of any error or heresy in Hus, neither did he accuse him of such; but it was the pope who accused him, and it was therefore before the pope that he must clear himself. Testimony was borne to this by the High Burggrave of Prague and others in a letter in the Bohemian language to King Sigismund, dated October 7th, in which they also entreated him on their own account to obtain for Hus a public hearing in the council, "that he might not be put to shame in a corner to the disgrace of their nationality and of the land of Bohemia."

Four days afterwards, on the Thursday before the festival of St. Gallus, October 11th, 1414, Hus started with the three lords appointed to accompany him from Krakovetz on the road to Constance, taking leave of his friends in an earnest and affectionate letter in the Bohemian tongue, which will appear *in extenso* afterwards.

CHAPTER VIII.

JOHN HUS AT CONSTANCE.

DURING Hus's journey to Constance WITHOUT safe conduct everything seemed to smile upon him. He travelled with his face uncovered, and never concealed by his hood. In every German town that he entered he was received, either by the clergy or by the civil authorities, in a friendly manner. The incumbent of Pernaü drank his health and told him that he had always been his friend. At Salzbach the "Landrecht" was sitting in the inn at which he lodged; he made himself known to the magistrates and elders, and had an agreeable conversation with them. In Lauf, he had a pleasant conference with the incumbent, who was a "great jurist." At Nuremberg he arrived on October 29th, his approach having been announced beforehand by travelling merchants; and crowds of people stood in the streets looking out and asking, "Which is Magister Hus?" One incumbent wrote him a letter, stating that he had long wished to talk with

him ; another came after dinner desiring to confer with him in a friendly manner. Hus declined a private conference, saying that he was in the habit of preaching publicly, and wished all comers to hear what he said. The conversation lasted about four hours, till twilight, and at its conclusion those who had taken part in it said to him : “ Certainly, magister, the things that we have heard are Catholic, and we have taught and held them many years ; and if there is nothing else against you, you will be sure to come forth or return with honour from the council.” Hus says that he did not meet an enemy on the journey ; nowhere was Divine service suspended on account of his presence ; and all applauded the German and Latin notification of his intention of travelling to the council of Constance to answer for his faith and doctrine, which he caused to be placarded in every imperial town. He was not, however, always without a precursor, who endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to raise a prejudice against him. The Bishop of Lubeck preceded him during part of his journey from place to place by one night, spreading a report that he was being conveyed in fetters in a cart, and warning people against him “ because he knew men’s minds.” The natural result was, that greater curiosity was roused and larger crowds assembled to see him.

Lord Wenceslas of Duba quitted Hus at Nuremberg, and went to the Rhine in quest of the promised safe conduct, while Hus travelled onwards

with John of Chlum and Henry Lacembok. At Biberach, John of Chlum talked so fluently and learnedly on behalf of Hus, preaching, as Hus says, more than he did himself, that he was taken for a Doctor of Theology, and was thenceforth sportively nicknamed by the party the "Doctoralis de Pibrach." They arrived at Constance on November 3rd, and Hus took lodgings with a "good widow" named Fida, in St. Paul's Street. The next day the two nobles visited Pope John XXIII. at his palace, and informed him that they had brought Magister John Hus under safe conduct from the King of the Romans and of Hungary. The pope promised that he would allow no violence to be used towards him, and that he should be safe in Constance, even "though he had killed his (the pope's) own brother." On November 4th, Hus wrote a Latin letter to his friends at Prague, telling them of the dearness of both food and lodging, and intimating that he should soon be in want of necessaries. On November 9th, the pope sent a message to him, informing him that in the plenitude of his power he had suspended the interdict and excommunication against him, and that he might walk freely about Constance, and visit whatever localities he thought fit, but withal requesting him not to attend high masses, in order to prevent scandal arising and to avoid becoming the subject of conversation. The safe conduct, which Wenceslas of Duba obtained from the king, was dated Spire, October 18th, but the exact date of its

arrival at Constance does not appear, although it had manifestly arrived before November 28th. It is couched in tolerably strong language, commanding all princes, lords, and officials to assist Hus on his journey to Constance, and allow him to "pass, halt, stay and return, freely," but I do not see anything in it which would make it of exceptional value as compared with other letters of safe conduct, though it was certainly not an ordinary passport. Full of hope that he would be allowed, according to Sigismund's promise, to defend his belief freely and publicly in the council, and to speak in the interest of the aims and endeavours to which he had devoted the greater part of his life and powers, Hus wrote on November 16th a Bohemian letter to the people of Prague, exhorting them to steadfastness in all that was good. After consulting with the lords who escorted him, he determined to take no active step till after the arrival of King Sigismund, who was expected to appear at Constance in person about Christmas.

But matters ere long took a very different turn. Hus's enemies were no laggards in making preparations for his destruction, and in collecting everything that might be useful for accusing him before the council. The first instigation thereto appears to have come from the chapters of Prague and the Vyssegrad, the two societies which were composed of the richest pluralists and foremost traffickers in the simony of the day in Bohemia, whose material interests were most deeply con-

cerned in the maintenance of the existing system. It was no doubt through their action that a collection was made from the clergy in all deaneries for the expenses of Bishop John of Litomysl, Hus's declared enemy, who was to go to the council and manage all for the attainment of the desired end. It was no doubt, too, by commission from the chapter of Prague, that Michael de Causis, its former agent at Rome, now betook himself to Constance to carry on the proceedings against Hus, which he had hitherto conducted in the papal curia. Two of Hus's former friends, Stanislas of Znaym, and Stephen of Palecz, were urged on against him by the goad of personal spite, and started for Constance at their own expense to testify and assist against him. Stanislas, who appears to have been residing at his birthplace in Moravia, died suddenly on the road from a paralytic stroke at "Henry's Castle," in the south of Bohemia. Palecz appears to have arrived at Constance a little earlier than Hus, and to have immediately united with Michael in his work. They were soon joined by other enemies of Hus's, in particular the former Dean and then Provost of Passau, Wenceslas Tiem, whose traffic in indulgences had been so terribly spoilt by Hus at Prague in 1412.

Michael de Causis placarded, on the day after Hus's arrival at Constance, public denunciations against him, as obstinate and contumacious under excommunication, and suspected of heresy; and

this he continued to do, day after day, without the slightest notice being taken thereof by Hus. Soon afterwards he not only drew up a formal accusation, which he gave in to Pope John, but also, in company with Palecz, paid almost daily visits to the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries present at Constance, representing to them the dangerous character of Hus, especially as an exciter of the nobility and people against the clergy, and insinuating that the humiliation of the ecclesiastical body would be greatly increased if he were allowed to return home safe and free from the council. Besides this he depicted Hus as a disseminator of Wycliffe's heretical doctrines, and even had the audacity to charge him with having brought about the German magisters' loss of the three votes in the University of Prague, and their consequent wholesale emigration in 1409, in order to rid himself of their opposition to his machinations. Such instigations were the more effective, as most of those to whom they were applied were of one spirit with those who applied them. At length an arrangement was made between the pope and the cardinals who managed the council, that Hus should be deprived of freedom, and that the authorities should proceed to judgment against him, which he had hitherto eluded by non-appearance to the papal citation. A silly story became suddenly current at Constance after Hus had been there three weeks and a half. It was said that he had been conveyed out of the

town in a hay cart, a tale which may have been purposely circulated to lend a colour to the action of the ecclesiastical authorities in arresting him. As a matter of fact, he had never passed the threshold of his lodgings, though he had privately celebrated mass there and conversed freely with any one who thought fit to visit him.

On November 28th, the Bishops of Augsburg and Trent, the Burgomaster of Constance, and a nobleman, John of Baden, came to Hus's lodgings about dinner-time, and told Lord John of Chlum that they had come to Magister John Hus on behalf of the cardinals and by command of the pope, who were ready to give him a hearing, even as he had himself previously asked to speak with them. Chlum saw at once through the transparent device, and gave them an angry reply, stating the position in which Hus was under the protection of a safe-conduct from the king. He turned to the burgomaster, and told him in German that even if the Devil were to come to plead his cause, he ought to have an honest hearing; and finally informed them, that it was the king's express wish that Hus should say nothing respecting his case till his (the king's) arrival at Constance, and warned them to do nothing contrary to the king's honour. The Bishop of Trent replied, that they had come merely in the interests of peace and to prevent a tumult.

Hearing this, Hus, who was probably personally unknown to the bishops and those with them, rose from table and said, that he had not made that

long journey to meet the cardinals, neither had he ever desired to speak with them apart, but had come to the whole council, and would there say what God should put in his mouth, and answer the questions asked him. Still, at the request of the cardinals, he was ready to go to them at once, and should he be questioned on any subject, he hoped he should prefer to suffer death rather than deny any truth that he had learned from the Scriptures or otherwise. Meanwhile, the house itself and several others had been surrounded by armed men belonging to the city. As Hus came downstairs, his hostess stepped forwards to bid him farewell. He solemnly blessed her, and she replied by tears. Hus then mounted a pony, and rode with the messengers and Lord John of Chlum to the pope's palace and the assembled cardinals.

On entering the room in which the cardinals were, Hus saluted them, and the president addressed him, saying, "Magister John! many strange things are said of you, that you have held and disseminated many errors in the land of Bohemia; we have therefore caused you to be summoned, because we wished to speak with you, to know if this be so." Hus replied, "Most reverend fathers! let your paternity know, that I would rather die than hold a single error. See! I have come freely to this council, and when it is shown me that I have erred in any respect, I am ready humbly to be corrected and to amend it." The cardinals said, "Verily, these are good words;"

and with that departed to their lodgings, leaving Hus in the custody of the pope's armed attendants, Chlum also remaining with him.

While Hus was in this situation, an incident occurred which does not appear to have any very great significance in itself, but which possessed such importance in the eyes of the Austrian censorship of the press, that it was struck out of Palacky's great "History of Bohemia." A Minorite monk appeared, went up to Hus and addressed him in a modest and lowly manner, telling him that he was a simple monk and layman who had heard many extraordinary things about him, and had therefore come with the desire of learning whether or no he held the things ascribed to him; in particular, that after consecration material bread remained in the sacrament of the altar. Hus replied that he did not. The monk repeated the question, and received the same answer no less than thrice. At this Chlum entered into the conversation, asking the monk what manner of man he was, and saying, "If any one once affirms or denies a thing to me, I believe him; this man has stated to you thrice that he doesn't hold it, and you keep on asking the question again." The monk replied, "Excellent knight! do not find fault with me, layman and simple brother that I am, for asking questions for the sake of instruction." He then proceeded to make further inquiries of Hus as to the hypostatic union of the two natures, Divine and Human, in the person of Christ. Upon

this, Hus said to Chlum in Bohemian, "Verily, this monk says he is a simple layman; he is not over simple, asking as he does for the resolution of a very deep question." Then, turning to the monk, he said, "Brother! you say that you are simple (*simplex*), but I consider that you are double (*duplex*)." The monk denied that he was double, but the magister proved it on the principles of morals, because his mouth pretended simplicity, while his deeds showed subtlety in inquiring into so deep a question. Hus, however, gave his opinion on the subject, and the monk retired with thanks for the good instruction that he had received. When he was gone, the pope's armed attendants came up, and asked Hus whether he knew who that monk was. He replied in the negative, and they informed him that it was Magister Didacus, who had the repute of being the subtlest theologian in all Lombardy. "I wish I had known it," cried Hus, who now first perceived that he had been undergoing a kind of examination; "I'd have plied him (*pupugissem*) differently with Scriptures. I hope they are all like this one; with the help of God and the support of Holy Scripture, I shall not be much afraid of them."

At four o'clock in the afternoon, the cardinals met again at the pope's residence, to consider what was to be done with Hus. Several Bohemians, both friends and foes of Hus, waited in an ante-room to see how the matter would end. Michael de Causis, Palecz and other enemies of the

prisoner could not restrain their joy, dancing about (*saltantes*) and exclaiming, "Ha! ha! we've got him now; he won't go out from us till he pays the last farthing." Late in the evening, the pope's high steward came with a request to Lord John of Chlum to depart, and an order for Hus to remain in the palace. Chlum, in anger at Hus being thus arrested under pretext of a conference, hastened to the pope, whom he found still in the assembly, and addressed him in presence of the cardinals in the following words: "Holy father! this was not the promise made by your holiness to me and my uncle, Henry Lacembok. I told and still tell your holiness, that I brought Magister Hus under the safe-conduct of my lord the King of the Romans; and your holiness said, that if Hus had killed your own brother, he should be safe here, and you would neither let or hinder him, nor allow him to be let or hindered, nor take any steps against him. And lo! here he is arrested while under protection of the aforesaid safe-conduct, and one of your especial messengers—a Franciscan—was at the lodging to bring the magister. And your holiness must know, that I intend to cry aloud and warn all who have violated my lord's safe-conducts." The pope replied, "My brethren"—pointing to the cardinals—"are within hearing, and know that I never ordered him to be arrested; and that Franciscan is a 'ribald'—he does not belong to me." He afterwards took Chlum aside, and said to him, "You know on what a footing my affairs are with them. They delivered

him to me, and I was obliged to receive him into captivity."

Matters thus remained as they were. Chlum was obliged to retire, and Hus remained in custody in the pope's palace, where Peter Mladenovitz afterwards brought him his overcoat or cloak and money. At about nine o'clock he was taken to the house of the precentor of Constance, where a cardinal was lodging, and there remained for a week, carefully watched by a force of armed men. On December 6th, he was removed thence and transferred to the Dominican convent on the shore of the lake of Constance, and there thrust into a dark and gloomy dungeon in the immediate vicinity of a sewer.

This first step being taken, Michael de Causis and Palecz eagerly continued their work. They at once constructed a whole series of articles of accusation against him, and delivered them to the pope with the petition, that Hus might be tried upon them, and that special commissioners might be appointed for the purpose by the pope, as well as certain doctors, who should examine Hus's writings. Michael audaciously repeated in these articles all his old falsehoods respecting Hus's heretical doctrines, and added new ones, in particular, that Hus had publicly preached the necessity of receiving the sacrament of the altar under both kinds. In thus doing he took a dishonest advantage of the fact, that Hus's followers at Prague had since his departure, under the leadership of Jakaubek of

Stribro (Jacobellus), actually begun to administer it in that way. The wishes of Michael and Palecz were soon fulfilled by a resolution of the council (December 4th), appointing John, Patriarch of Constantinople, John, Bishop of Lubeck, and Bernard, Bishop of Castell, judicial commissioners in the matter of Hus. Full powers were given them to inquire into the charges alleged against him, but that of passing a final sentence was expressly taken out of the sphere of their commission.

Meanwhile John of Chlum had been using the utmost exertions to obtain Hus's release from prison. He publicly complained of the pope and cardinals for having arrested Magister John Hus, when under the protection of a safe-conduct from the king, exhibited the safe-conduct to all the principal personages assembled at Constance, and also to the more notable citizens of the place, and caused it to be read aloud to them. The Saturday before St. Thomas, he went alone and affixed to the doors of the cathedral and of all the churches in Constance a letter sealed with his own seal, arraigning the conduct of the pope and cardinals, and complaining that the pope himself had broken his plighted word, by arresting and still detaining in captivity Magister John Hus, while under the protection of a royal safe-conduct. He also sent word of the violation of the safe-conduct to King Sigismund, who immediately dispatched a special embassy to Constance to demand the liberation of Hus, and even went so far as to threaten to break open the

doors of his prison by force, if his demand were not complied with. But the pope and council paid no regard whatever either to his requests or to his threats, in the execution of which they did not believe.

At length on Christmas day, about midnight, King Sigismund with his queen, Barbara of Cilly, with numerous princes and princesses, and with a splendid retinue of about a thousand horsemen, made his grand entry into Constance by torchlight in extremely severe and wintry weather. Scarcely allowing the queen and princesses time to warm themselves and change their travelling clothes, he betook himself before break of day in solemn procession by torchlight to the brilliantly lighted cathedral, where the pope awaited him, and immediately on his arrival proceeded to celebrate high mass with unusual splendour and magnificence. According to ancient custom the King of the Romans ministered at the altar vested as a deacon and chanted with a loud voice the gospel: "Then went forth a decree from Cæsar, etc." Mass over, the pope delivered to him the consecrated sword, bidding him to use it for the defence of the Church, which Sigismund joyfully promised to do.

The first business however transacted by Sigismund with the fathers assembled for the council was not of a very pleasant or tranquillizing character, touching as it did the imprisonment of Hus. The king undoubtedly felt deeply the insult offered to his dignity in the violation of his letter patent

of safe-conduct, which he had also good reason to fear would cause great displeasure and discontent in the empire, and especially in the lands appertaining to the crown of Bohemia. But as the pope cast the onus of this off his own shoulders before the king, as he had done previously before Chlum, Sigismund soon perceived that he had to do not so much with the pope, as with the whole body of assembled cardinals, prelates and doctors. The last meetings and conferences held in 1414 were principally occupied with this question, and when the fathers set up *their* right of dealing with a person accused of heresy according to the laws of the Church against *his* right of affording protection to a subject, Sigismund several times quitted the assembly with quick steps and in violent anger. Matters even went so far that he contemplated or pretended to contemplate abandoning the council entirely and troubling himself no further about it; nay, in order to prove the honesty of his purpose, he even quitted Constance not long after his arrival sometime about the end of December. A deputation sent after him informed him, that the council would disperse at once, if he impeded its legitimate action. Sigismund was not inclined to take upon himself the responsibility of such a resolution. What was Hus to him, that the hopes entertained by all Christendom of the reunion and reform of the Church should be brought to nothing? The higher significance of Hus and his work was a secret to him; he comforted his conscience by

the authority of the Church, which was now assembled in larger numbers than ever before; and the Church taught him and afterwards certified him by a formal document, that, whereas by law Divine and human no promise made to the detriment of the Catholic faith was binding, so neither was he bound to keep a promise made to a heretic. He therefore eventually allowed his anger to be appeased, and no longer offered any impediment to the proceedings against Hus taking their course.

So cruel was Hus's imprisonment and so foul the atmosphere of his dungeon, that his health could not but suffer. After some weeks he was attacked by so severe a fever, that his life was despaired of, and the pope found himself compelled not only to send his own physician to attend him, but also to cause him to be removed into a more wholesome chamber near the refectory in the same convent. And as the forms of law, which were scrupulously observed by the commissioners in their conduct of the case, required all witnesses to take their oaths in the sight of the prisoner, fifteen of them were brought at once in front of the prison, while Hus was lying in one of his most violent paroxysms of pain, and took their oaths one after the other before his eyes. Some of these, as Palecz, were eager enough for Hus's destruction, but others were dragged forward to give evidence against their will. One of these, a layman, actually said in Bohemian before his name was called, "I swear to God, that I know nothing to testify."

Michael de Causis said to him: "Dear brother! thou knowest not what they will ask thee, and swearest that thou knowest nothing to testify! I would testify against my own father, if it were aught against the faith." The layman replied: "True, but I know nothing." In all this nothing was more deeply felt by Hus than his treatment by his apostate friend Stephen Palecz, who was so far from sympathizing with him in his sickness, that he cast in his teeth, as he lay in anguish, that since the birth of Christ there was never a greater heretic than Hus save Wycliffe. No advocate or procurator was allowed Hus to assist him in his defence or in taking exception to the witnesses, many of whom were his mortal enemies. The excuse was, that it was illegal for any one to defend a person suspected of heresy.

On recovering from his severe illness, Hus wrote his first letter from prison to the people of Prague, dated January 19th, and intended to be read aloud in the chapel Bethlehem, in which he informed them of his sufferings, and committed his cause to the will of God, asking them for their prayers, that he might be enabled to persevere in the grace of God even until death. The power of carrying on correspondence was procured for him by his Bohemian friends at Constance, who gained over some of his attendants or guards to convey letters secretly to and from him. Foremost among these was John of Chlum, a man both enlightened and firm, who never let anything slip that might conduce towards obtain-

ing the release or forwarding the interests of Hus. Lords Wenceslas of Duba and Henry Lacembok likewise remained at Constance with the king's court, and there were also several other Bohemian gentlemen of rank in Sigismund's service. Of the clergy there was Hus's devoted friend, John of Reinstein, commonly called "Cardinal" from frequent employment on King Wenceslas's affairs at the court of Rome. He and Lord John of Chlum had been very early appointed deputies from the university to the council, although Stephen Palecz also claimed the title for himself, having been perhaps nominated as such by the Faculty of Theology. John of Chlum's secretary was a young B.A., Peter of Mladenovitz, who compiled the memoirs of Hus's residence and captivity at Constance, which, with Hus's correspondence, form the basis of our knowledge of what passed there. Mladenovitz wrote both a shorter and a longer narrative, the former of which is given with divers additions and suppressions in the account prefixed to the Nuremberg edition of Hus's works (1715); while the latter, which includes a large number of valuable documents, has been carefully edited and published in the "Documenta" by Palacky.

The sympathy which Hus's friends entertained for him was of no little-minded character. Although they deplored his personal sufferings, yet they set a higher value upon the cause, which they had taken up in concert with him and under his guidance. One of those who held him in highest

honour, Lord Henry Skopek of Duba, sent a message to him by Chlum, saying how rejoiced he was at Hus having met with so blessed a thing as persecution for the truth ; and Chlum exhorted him in his letters not to forsake the truth for any terror on account of this miserable life. Nor was Hus from the first otherwise than prepared for either a good or an evil ending to his undertaking.

As soon as Hus's health began to be re-established, the judicial commissioners proceeded to examine him respecting the charges brought against him. In particular they required from him (1) a written exposition of his opinions respecting the notorious forty-five articles extracted from the writings of Wycliffe and condemned as heretical in the so-called council of Rome ; (2) answers to the fourteen articles extracted by Palecz principally from Hus's work "*De Ecclesia*," and afterwards (3) to those extracted from the same work by Gerson, the chancellor of the University of Paris, who had attained a position of high consideration in the council. Hus was compelled to compose his replies and explanations from memory without the aid of books, yet when they were compared with the MS. written with his own hand, it was found that they corresponded word for word. He proved with regard to the greater part of the articles, that Palecz's extracts had been unfairly made, some passages having been abbreviated at the beginning, others in the middle, and others at the end, while others had never existed in his work at all ; and that

for the most part an incorrect sense had been foisted upon them. If, however, he had erred in aught, he declared that he had no intention of maintaining anything obstinately, but intended to abide by the decision of the council and receive instruction.

The commissioners endeavoured to induce him to submit to the decision of twelve or thirteen magisters to be appointed by the council. But this he resolutely refused to do, declaring that he was ready to stand before the whole council and there and there only to answer for his belief. His friends at Prague, especially the jurist, John of Jesenitz, considered it an error on his part to have given any answer at all in prison, but Hus himself considered it impossible to avoid doing so, especially as he was not allowed the assistance of a legal adviser. But he made a point of placing copies of his written answers in the hands of his friends, lest false reports should hereafter be disseminated about them. He also endeavoured, through the Bohemian lords at Constance, to prevail upon King Sigismund to obtain him a public hearing in a full assembly of the council, after which he hoped by the king's aid to be more easily released from imprisonment. King Sigismund was also urged in the same direction by more powerful intercessors. The violation of the safe-conduct had created a very angry feeling among the Bohemian and Moravian nobles, who considered it a matter affecting their own honour. Seeing that Sigismund, "the heir presumptive of the Bohemian crown,"

was now utterly neglecting the rectification of such a matter, the Bohemian barons, with Lord Lacko of Kravary, the Lord Lieutenant (*Heitman*) of Moravia, at their head, met at Mezeritsch in the beginning of February, and thence sent him a letter, requesting him to abide by his safe-conduct, to effect the liberation of Hus, and to procure Hus a free and public hearing in the council; otherwise "many would have cause to dread his letters of safe-conduct." Sigismund saw the danger of neglecting such utterances, and exerted himself with the council to obtain a promise, that Hus should be publicly heard before any sentence was passed upon him.

Although Hus, on learning that some of his friends at Prague were anxious to follow him to Constance, had earnestly advised and warned them against running any such risk, nevertheless his old and faithful adherent, Magister Christian of Prachatitz, ventured upon the journey, and Hus's friends at Constance actually obtained him access to Hus's prison on some day not later than March 3rd. This unexpected visit drew tears of joy from the eyes of the prisoner. Magister Christian did not, however, altogether escape the danger which was foreseen and dreaded for him. Michael de Causis, on hearing of his arrival at Constance, procured his arrest and handed in thirty articles against him, to which he was obliged to give replies in writing. He was afterwards released, partly through Sigismund's intercession, and merely required to take

a certain oath in presence of the Patriarch of Constantinople. He was then allowed to return to Prague, and commenced his homeward journey on March 17th or 18th. Hus had also reason to fear that Magister John Cardinal was to be subjected to a similar citation, and caused him to be counselled to keep as close as possible to the king's suite. The coming and fate of Jerome of Prague—the “Whiskerandos (*Barbatus*), who wouldn't obey the advice of his friends”—will be related in his own biography.

Meanwhile matters were taking a turn at Prague, for the explanation of which we must recur to the time of Hus's departure for Constance. Four churches there, and four churches only, were in the hands of resolute adherents of Hus, one of them being that of the non-resident Michael de Causis. The ministers of these four and their subordinates were in evil odour with the other incumbents of Prague, who excited some of their parishioners against them, asserting that the sacraments received at their hands were invalid, and in this way inducing the timid to refrain from confessing and communicating in the four churches thus denounced. The majority of the Prague clergy, also, as well as the penitentiaries of the cathedral, refused to hear the confessions of lay people, who attended the sermons of Hus's adherents at Bethlehem or elsewhere. This led the clergy of Hus's party to advise the people to disregard the previously existing rule, by which confessions were made and heard in each man's parish church,

and nowhere else. Then, as more and more pressure was put upon the people by the clergy hostile to Hus, especially in matters reserved either to the archbishop or to the pope, the priests of Hus's party proceeded to transgress the regulation by which such matters were governed, and gave absolution in cases of this kind by mere virtue of their sacerdotal power. In this Magister Jakaubek of Stribro took the lead, following also the example set him by Hus in the country by visiting other churches and performing Divine service in them. This he did sometimes without the consent and against the will of their incumbents.

Not long after Hus's departure from Constance, a far more important innovation was originated by Jakaubek, which not only exhibited disobedience to authority in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, but also transgressed the then universal custom of receiving the sacrament of the altar in one kind, and in one kind only. Magister Jakaubek, in pondering the words of our Lord in John vi. 51, "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and *drink His Blood*, ye have no life in you," elicited the meaning, that the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ ought to be received, not only by the priests, but also by the laity, in both kinds, viz., in bread and wine. According to the principle, that ecclesiastical tradition ought not to be in opposition to Holy Scripture, he concluded that the existing custom of distributing the sacrament to the laity under one kind only, was contrary to the law of

Christ and ought to be reformed. In the first zeal of his conviction he announced a public disputation in the Carolinum on the subject, and expounded his views in an assembly of the doctors, magisters, and others, in such a manner, that many adhered to them at once and began to act accordingly without delay. The first of these was the incumbent of St. Martin's-in-the-Wall, Magister John of Hradetz, whose example was followed in Christian of Prachatitz's church of St. Michael's, where Magister Jakaubek was in the habit of preaching, and in that of St. Adalbert in Jirchary. Thus far the matter had ripened within three or four weeks after the departure of Hus. The archbishop's officials immediately issued orders prohibiting the innovation, whereupon Magister Jakaubek presented himself uncited before Archbishop Conrad's vicar general, Canon Wenceslas of Kaurim, and requested to be informed or instructed why hindrance should be given to the form of reception which was in accordance with the gospel. To this he received no answer, but was shortly afterwards excommunicated without any judicial proceeding. Jakaubek paid no regard to this excommunication, which indeed produced no evil results for him in the then state of feeling at Prague. His teaching was opposed by Professor Andrew of Brod, first in a private letter, and then in a learned treatise. Jakaubek replied in a treatise, in which he set forth his proofs and arguments at greater length than he had done in the disputation in the Carolinum.

This controversy soon caused a disruption in the ranks of Hus's party, as not all the clergy who had adhered to him, were ready to participate in Jakaubek's innovation, which was not necessarily connected with Church reform, as hitherto contemplated. Even one of Hus's representatives in the chapel Bethlehem, the priest Havlik, placed himself in an attitude of opposition to Jakaubek and his followers, and, ere long, wavered in his attachment to Hus's principles and Hus's person. Thus, when he read aloud in Bethlehem Hus's first letter from prison to the people of Prague, observing that it was written on torn paper, he exhibited it with a grimace, exclaiming: "Ha! Ha! Hus is now short of paper!" To set bounds to the evil consequences of such discord, many desired to know Hus's own sentiments on the subject, and he was therefore requested by John of Chlum to state them. Upon his own principle, that the custom of the Church might not be counter to the express tenour of Holy Scripture, it was impossible for him to oppose the innovation, which could scarcely have originated at his own instigation. He therefore wrote in his prison a brief treatise on reception in both kinds, taking as his basis the facts, that such was the teaching both of the Gospels and of St. Paul, and that such was also the practice of the primitive Church. In a letter to Chlum he advised, that endeavours should be made to procure a bull, granting permission to those, who devoutly requested it, to partake in both kinds under proper

safeguards. His declaration respecting communion in both kinds gave a great impulse to the practice, so that by the end of the first half of 1415 it had spread from Prague to many other towns, and even villages, in Bohemia, and the majority of the population was already enlisted in its favour.

Hus wrote several other Latin treatises in his prison, at the special instance of some of his warders, whose regard and good-will he seems to have gained, all of which appear in the Nuremberg edition of his Latin works. Among these were "Expositions of the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments," and treatises "On the Body of Christ," "On Marriage," "On Repentance," "On the Three Enemies of Man," "On Sin and its Generation," "On the Love and Knowledge of God," etc.

The case of Hus was, however, only one of the things with which the attention of the council was engaged, and it was therefore temporarily neglected, while other pressing matters were being attended to. But on March 20th, 1415, an event occurred, which exercised a considerable influence upon the destiny of Hus, for the full explanation and understanding whereof we must again recur to circumstances of earlier date.

When Pope John XXIII. entered Constance in solemn procession on October 28th, 1414, with nine cardinals, numerous archbishops and bishops, and his whole curia and suite, an anxious foreboding took possession of his soul, as soon as he descried the city, in which all his magnificence was to vanish

into nothing. In his trouble of mind he wished to recall all that he had said and done in favour of Constance, and reassemble the council in some Italian city. But in vain ; the cardinals prevented any such change of purpose. As, however, according to his view, the council of Constance was merely a continuation of that of Pisa, and its aim and object merely, on the one hand, the putting an end to the trinity of popes by the deposition of both his rivals ; and, on the other, a reform of the Church, which was to be accomplished by the extirpation of the heresy of Wycliffe and Hus, he still comforted himself with the hope of successfully manipulating the council according to his will, and dissolving it at the earliest moment. Still he felt from time to time a heavy weight upon his heart, when he perceived the stern and resolute determination of many of the fathers. The discontent, which began to display itself before his eyes, gained greater and greater strength, the more fathers and influential members of the Church arrived at Constance from distant regions. The view, contrary to his own, that the council of Constance was not to be reckoned a mere continuation of that of Pisa, but was to be considered a separate and independent council, and that it was necessary that all three popes should be compelled to abdicate their dignity, obtained daily more and more resolute adherents, especially after the arrival of the highly-reverenced Cardinal PETER D'AILLY, who was looked upon as the father of Church reform

in his day. In order to obtain free course for such views, and the projects of reform connected with them, it was proposed as early as November 12th, 1414, that the council should be divided into "nations," and that the votes on all important matters should be taken, not by number of individual voices, but by nations. This innovation was, after some opposition, accepted and established as a law on February 7th, 1415. The first direct opposition to John XXIII. exhibited itself on November 19th, 1414, when the question was discussed whether the ambassadors of Gregory XII. should be allowed the title of papal legates and access to the council as such. John succeeded, indeed, in quelling this attempt at opposition, but, owing to his own conduct, which sank more and more deeply into unworthiness, kept approaching nearer and nearer to the inevitable abyss. A memorial was drawn up and circulated among the members of the council, which, in fifty-four accusatory articles, delineated the entire public and private life of this wicked man. To avoid the scandal and danger of such inquiries, John XXIII. declared on February 16th, his willingness to lay down the papal dignity under certain conditions. The wording of this declaration being considered too indefinite and equivocal, he finally, after a good deal of negotiation, agreed, on March 1st, to another, expressed in most definite and unequivocal terms, declaring that, for the sake of peace and unity in the Church, he would resign his dignity the instant

that Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. should, either by their own good-will or by death, give cause to expect, that the long looked-for end of the existing disunion was approaching. But he soon gave people reason to think that he repented of his promise. Complaining of the insalubrious air of Constance, and the danger he professed to apprehend there for his person, he requested that the council might be transferred to some Italian city, and by various preparations brought himself under suspicion of an intention to escape secretly, and proclaim the dissolution of the council. It was, therefore, considered necessary to watch the city gates most strictly, and King Sigismund took care to warn him not to do anything of a hasty nature, if he wished to avoid disagreeable consequences. He determined, however, to run the risk, and took as his accomplice Frederic, Duke of Austria, whom he had the year before elevated to the position of generalissimo of the Church of Rome. The duke got up a grand tournament for the afternoon of March 20th, and while public attention was directed towards the splendid preparations that were being made, the pope disguised himself as a common man-at-arms, escaped unrecognized through one of the city gates, and by help of the duke's attendants, arrived before the next dawn at Schaffhausen, a town belonging to the duke.

The next day looked upon a scene of terror and confusion in Constance, and at one time it appeared as if all was over with the council. The burgo-

master called the citizens under arms, the money-changers and merchants shut their shops, and no one knew what to do or what was about to happen. But King Sigismund sprang on horseback, and in company with the Count Palatine and other nobles, rode through the whole town with sound of trumpet, exhorting every one to be tranquil, and not to lose heart, and promising aid and protection. "Let who will," he cried, "follow the example of the fugitives, ways and means will be found for their return. The council stands firm and will not allow itself to be broken up." He also encouraged the assembled fathers, by assuring them that he would protect them with his life and with all his power. By such energetic action he succeeded in saving the council from the evil consequences that might have resulted from this untoward occurrence, and all the harm that ensued fell upon the heads of the aiders and abettors of the pope's flight. Duke Frederic was placed under the ban of the empire, lost part of his dominions in the consequent war, and found no mercy till he bound himself to bring the pope back. The council also proceeded to take action against the pope, first suspending him from his high dignity, and then (May 29th) actually declaring his deposition.

The flight of the pope caused an alteration in Hus's imprisonment. John XXIII. having sent orders from Schaffhausen to all his attendants, who had remained behind in Constance, to follow him, Hus's warders on Palm Sunday, March 24th,

gave up the keys of his prison to the king and quitted the city. Hus was left with nothing to eat, and wrote to some of his friends begging them, "if they loved the poor Goose," to contrive that the king should send him guards from his own suite, or liberate him from prison that evening. But all in vain. Sigismund had no longer the will to release Hus, though he still played the hypocrite a little longer with his friends. He consulted with the fathers of the council, and on that very day gave up the keys of the prison in his own name and that of the council to the Bishop of Constance, who caused Hus to be conveyed in the night time by boat under the escort of 170 armed men to Gottlieben, a castle of his own on the lake. To Hus the change of prison was much for the worse. He was placed in a room in the upper part of a tower, where the atmosphere indeed was salubrious, but his feet were fettered with chains, and every night, when he went to bed, his hands were fastened to the wall by a chain attached to a manacle. Neither was he sufficiently supplied with food or drink, so that he soon began to suffer from various ailments, especially from one previously unknown to him, the stone.

Not long afterwards (April 6th)—the powers of the previous commission having expired with the flight of the pope—the council appointed four new commissioners, at the head of whom was Cardinal d'Ailly, with power to add to their number by co-opting other prelates and doctors, both for the

conduct of the process against Hus, and also for the purpose of examining and reporting upon the writings of Wycliffe. These commissioners held several private examinations of Hus at Gottlieben, but no detailed accounts of them have come down to us. They also reported unfavourably with regard to the works of Wycliffe, and on May 4th the council formally confirmed the condemnation of the forty-five articles extracted from them, which had been issued three years previously by the so-called council of Rome.

It was but natural that the Bohemians and Moravians, inclined as the majority of them were to the doctrines of Hus, should be offended, should complain of the wrongful imprisonment of their teacher, and should look with displeasure upon the dishonourable conduct of their future king. Nay, sympathy exhibited itself even in Poland, where the Bohemian reformers had many friends, especially at the royal court. The nobility of Moravia met at Brünn on May 8th, and that of Bohemia at Prague on May 12th, and at these meetings energetic letters were addressed to King Sigismund, as heir presumptive of the Bohemian crown, which spoke plainly and bitterly enough of the violation of the safe conduct and of his own word by the arrest and cruel imprisonment of Hus. No request was made that Hus should not be subjected to trial, or that he should be allowed to escape from the law or from his judges, but it was requested that he should not be imprisoned, or judged secretly in a

corner, but should be permitted to plead his cause freely at a public hearing. Several copies of these letters were made, to which many nobles of higher or lower rank, who had been unable to attend the meetings, afterwards affixed their seals. A letter was written at the same time from the meeting at Prague to the lords at the court of Sigismund at Constance, requesting them to aid by their intercession towards obtaining the fulfilment of the wishes of the writers.

But before these letters crossed the Bohemian and Moravian frontiers the lords sojourning at Constance took up the matter themselves, and sent in a letter of plaint to the council, in which they complained of the arrest of Hus, which had taken place contrary to the safe conduct, and of his inhuman treatment in his grievous imprisonment, and requested the council to make a righteous ending in his case without delay. Several Polish nobles united in this petition to the council, which was read in presence of all who had set their signatures to it by Peter Mladenovitz in the session of the council on May 13th. The chief of the Bohemian lords who signed it were Wenceslas of Duba, John of Chlum, Henry Lacembok and Puta of Ilburk; and the principal Polish nobles who did so were Hanus Halissky and Zawise Czerni, the Polish king's ambassadors to the council. And as Bishop John of Litomysl had shortly before made certain remarks in an assembly of the German nation in the council respecting the novel intro-

duction of the reception of the sacrament under both kinds in Bohemia, in which he had described the irreverence with which, according to him, the sacrament was treated, the Bohemian lords at the conclusion of the letter separately requested the council not to give credence to any such slanders, which proceeded from enemies and defamers of the realm of Bohemia. The bishop replied first orally, and then three days afterwards in writing, partly denying the language ascribed to him, and partly explaining that he had not said such things for the purpose of insulting the land of Bohemia, which was his own fatherland, but in order that its reputation might be cleared by a stop being put to heretical innovations. To this the lords two days afterwards returned a sharp and haughty answer.

While the Bohemian and Polish lords were waiting for an answer to the petition which they had laid before the council, the letter of the Moravian lords at their meeting at Brünn on behalf of Hus arrived at Constance, and gave them a fresh impulse to persevere in their urgency towards the council. They therefore, on May 31st, addressed another letter to the presidents of the four nations, into which the council was divided. They represented that the charges brought against Hus emanated entirely from his enemies, and that these were endeavouring, from hatred towards him, to prepossess the leading members of the council with the idea that it was Hus's intention to persist obsti-

nately in mischievous doctrines. They appealed to his frequent declarations of earlier and later date, according to which he was ready to submit to better instruction ; and they therefore requested that Hus might be effectually questioned by learned men in the council as to the meaning of passages in his writings, which had in their (the lords') opinion been extracted from them in a mutilated and garbled condition. Moreover, as Hus had been sorely harassed by severe imprisonment, and required relaxation to acquire strength to give the necessary explanations, they requested that he might be released from such imprisonment and placed in the hands of some bishops or other commissioners of the council ; they (the lords) would furnish sufficient guarantees that he would not withdraw himself by flight from the power of such commissioners, before the final decision as to his faith was arrived at. The patriarch of Antioch replied on the same day, in the name of the council, that it could not assent to the liberation of Hus, not even if a thousand sureties were offered, but that with regard to the request previously preferred, to that it agreed, and would give Hus a public hearing on the Wednesday next ensuing, June 8th.

Nothing could have been more courageous, straightforward, honourable, and praiseworthy than the conduct of these Bohemian and Moravian lords and their Polish coadjutors. Like Hus himself they were in the midst of enemies, with only a false king upon whom they could in any wise

rely. The Poles indeed were invested with the sanctity of ambassadors, but the Bohemians and Moravians had no such support. No ambassador had been sent by King Wenceslas of Bohemia to the council, in spite of all entreaties and all representations. The reconciliation of the two surviving brothers of the House of Luxemburg had been but skin deep. The less energetic and more honest of the twain had soon found reason to distrust his more energetic and less honest brother, and had steadfastly abstained from allowing himself to be represented at the council. Neither were the meetings of the lords in Bohemia and Moravia regular and formal meetings of the estates; certain nobles were but acting by themselves and using their rights as freemen to expostulate with the faithless heir presumptive of their crown. The support received by those sojourning at Constance was not official, and not backed by the power of their king and country, so that the greater credit is due to them for the steadfast and unflinching manner in which they persevered to the utmost in their energetic interference on behalf of their isolated and cruelly treated countryman. And the result lives in history. Instead of a secret inquisition and secret murder, we have the record of a public trial and a judicial homicide, in which we are at a loss to discover any valid or reasonable grounds of condemnation.

CHAPTER IX.

JOHN HUS'S TRIAL.

First Day.

THE 5th of June now arrived, and cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and almost all the ecclesiastical dignitaries sojourning at Constance crowded into the refectory of the Franciscans or Minorites. With them came doctors, magisters, bachelors of theology, and others of inferior standing, and the hall was full. Orders were given for the evidence against Magister John Hus to be read aloud, and then for the reading of the articles or passages extracted in garbled form enough from his own works, some of which were even pure inventions. Condemnation was to be pronounced over these before Magister John Hus was to be heard; it was to be pronounced in the absence of the prisoner, and then he was to be admitted to—Heaven knows what manner of hearing!

Nay, the draft of his condemnation itself was ready. First, a few verses of the fiftieth Psalm

were read, beginning with the sixteenth verse : " But unto the ungodly said God : Why dost thou preach My laws and takest My covenant in thy mouth ? Whereas thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast My words behind thee. When thou sawest a thief thou consentedst unto him, and hast been partaker with the adulterers. Thou hast let thy mouth speak wickedness, and with thy tongue thou hast set forth deceit. These things hast thou done and I held my tongue. Thou thoughtest wickedly that I am even such a one as thyself ; but I will reprove thee and set before thee the things that thou hast done." After this what professed to be part of a letter, which Hus had left behind for his friends on commencing his journey to Constance, was read to this effect : " If it fall to my lot to abjure, be assured, that, although I confess and abjure with my mouth, yet with my heart I shall not consent thereto." It is needless to say, that not a word to this effect is contained in the actual letter, which will be given hereafter *in extenso*, but that the above so-called extract is a vile and malicious invention.

Meanwhile a Bohemian, of whom nothing else is known, but who is denoted in Mladenovitz's narrative by the letter " V," probably for " Ulric," happened to be standing in the outer ring close to the reader, obtained a view of the papers before him, and thus perceived what was in contemplation. He ran and told P., *i.e.* Peter Mladenovitz, who ran and told lords W. and Joan, *i.e.* Lords

Wenceslas of Duba, and John of Chlum. They went immediately to King Sigismund, and informed him with grave and serious indignation of the mockery of justice that was being enacted. Sigismund, knowing the tone and temper of the nobles of the land, to the crown of which he was heir presumptive, dared not disregard such representations, and at once sent the "princes," Louis of Heidelberg, Count Palatine, and Frederic, Burgrave of Nuremberg, with a message to the council, forbidding its members to condemn or settle anything at that hearing, and bidding them hear John Hus himself patiently, and deliver to him (Sigismund) their decision upon the different articles in writing, and he would entrust them to certain doctors to be considered.

Moreover, in order to exhibit the evil animus and unfaithfulness of those who had extracted the articles from Hus's writings, the lords who were his friends determined to lay before the council copies of his work "On the Church," and of his treatises against Stanislas of Znaym and Stephen Palecz, written by his own hand. These they sent by the king's princely messengers, with the proviso that they were to be returned when done with. John Hus appears then, and not till then, to have been brought into the council hall. The Count Palatine and the Burgrave delivered their message from the king, and also that from the Bohemian lords, laid the copies of the books before the council, and departed. These were given to

Hus, who took them, looked carefully over them, raised them up in his hands, and publicly acknowledged them to be his, stating in addition, that if it were shown that he had set down anything wrong or erroneous therein, he was and had been prepared humbly to correct it.

The articles and statements of the witnesses were then read aloud. When the magister wanted to reply thereto, many shouted simultaneously against him. His friends were unable to obtain entrance into the hall, but heard him as he answered, turning towards those who were shouting and clamouring against him, now on the right hand, now on the left hand, and now behind his back. When he wanted to explain ambiguities or different acceptations of words in the articles complained of, which the extractors had frequently wrested to a sense which they were never intended to bear, a shout was immediately raised: "Drop your sophistry, and say Yes or No." When he alleged the authorities of holy doctors on behalf of certain points in the "articles," many immediately shouted, as with one voice, that the citations were not to the purpose. At length, seeing that it was useless to answer, he held his peace. Others immediately shouted: "See! you are now silent! 'Tis a token that you agree with those errors."

The authorities now, having the fear of the king and the dauntless Bohemian lords before their eyes, and perceiving that so disorderly a trial could, under the circumstances, lead to no satis-

factory result, closed the sitting, and appointed a further hearing for the next day but one, June 7th. As Hus was being led away by the Bishop of Riga, in whose charge he was, as well as Jerome, he espied his friends, and, offering his hand to them, said: "Don't be afraid of me." They answered: "We are not." He added: "I know it well, I know it well;" and blessing the people with his hand, as he went up the steps, he smiled and rejoiced, going away joyfully after the mockery with which he had been treated.

I add a translation of a Latin letter written by Hus immediately after this first "hearing" to his friends sojourning at Constance:

"God Almighty gave me to-day a brave and stout heart; two articles are already struck out. I hope, by God's grace, that more will be. Almost all shouted against me, as the Jews did against Jesus. They have not yet come to the first point, *i.e.* that I should admit, that all the 'articles' stand written in the treatises. You did wrong in giving in the treatise 'Against an Anonymous (*Occultus*) Adversary' along with that 'On the Church.'* You should give nothing in but the treatises against Stanislas and Palecz. It is well done, that the princes required my book to be returned to them; for some shouted: 'Let it be burnt!' in particular Michael de Causis, whom I heard. I did not think, that in the whole number of clergy, I had a single friend save 'the father'" (of whom more anon) "and a Polish doctor, whom I know. I thanked the Bishop of Litomysl for his kind assistance; but he said no more than: 'What have I done for you?' I am very grateful that you have thus collected

* This was a mistake on the part of Hus. This treatise was not laid before the council. In a later letter he expressed his satisfaction that "*Occultus* had remained *Occultus*."

the articles, and it is a good thing to publish a copy of them in that shape, etc. The presidents said I should have another hearing. They refused to hear the distinction I drew respecting the Church. Greet the faithful lords and friends of the truth, and pray God for me, for it is needful. I think they will not admit on my behalf the opinion of St. Augustine respecting the Church, and respecting its predestined members and the fore-known, and respecting evil dignitaries. Oh, if a hearing were granted me to answer their arguments wherewith they want to impugn the articles that are in the treatises! I think many who shout would hold their peace. As it is willed in heaven, so be it!"

It is easy enough to explain the hostility of the mass of the council towards John Hus, there being in reality but few who were truly zealous for Church reform, while the many desired to uphold in the main the existing system, by which they profited, introducing only modifications intended rather for show than practical effect. But there were also men there, like Cardinal d'Ailly, who were truly anxious for reform, and that a reform of an extensive, and in some respects radical, nature. How was it that they were animated by an equally bitter spirit against one who had at heart the self-same ends and objects as themselves? I think two reasons may be given for this. In the first place they espied great and serious danger in a reform originating from beneath and not from above, from the inferior clergy and not from the princes and dignitaries of the Church. It was an aristocratic, not a democratic reform, that they wished to carry out, whereas the movement origi-

nated by Hus was of a thoroughly democratic nature, and they feared that it might cause the leading strings to escape out of their hands. In the second place, Hus, in despair of a reform commencing from above, had called upon kings, princes, nobles, and people, to insist upon needful reforms, and even constrain them to be enacted by external pressure. This was an unpardonable crime. The spiritual power claimed to be the superior of the temporal, and now this daring cleric had called upon the temporal power to force the spiritual to reform itself, whether it would or no. Thus, both the better and the worse members of the council were banded together in an unholy alliance against one poor priest, whose only fault was, that he had clamoured over-loudly for the selfsame ends and objects, for which the Council itself had been convened.

Second Day.

On the second day, June 7th, Hus was brought into the Franciscan refectory, and the hearing began about an hour after a total eclipse of the sun. Armed men stood round to prevent the escape of the one poor priest. The "articles" were read aloud, respecting which witnesses had testified at Prague before the vicar of the archbishop and again at Constance, and Hus made his comments upon some of them. While this was going on, the king arrived and entered the council hall, bringing with him Lords Wenceslas of Duba

and John of Chlum with their secretary, Peter Mladenovitz.

At their arrival an "article" was being read, which charged Hus with preaching at various times in the chapel Bethlehem, and in other places at Prague, many errors and heresies out of Wycliffe's books, in particular that material bread remained on the altar after the consecration of the host. Hus, calling God and his conscience to witness, replied that he had never said or stated any such thing. He admitted that when the Archbishop of Prague had forbidden the employment of the term "bread," he had resisted the order, because in John vi. Christ had eleven times termed himself "the bread of angels," "the bread that giveth life to the world," "the bread that came down from heaven." For this reason he had refused to contradict the gospel, but never had he said anything of the kind respecting material bread. Cardinal d'Ailly then took a paper, which he said had come into his hands the evening before, and asked Magister John Hus whether he assumed the separate existence of "Universals," thus, as a nominalist, intending to entangle Hus, a realist, in a scholastic difficulty. Hus replied that he did, as St. Anselm and others had done before him. The cardinal then endeavoured to prove the impossibility of a realist holding the orthodox view of transubstantiation, to which, however, Hus steadily adhered. Two Englishmen then entered into the discussion on the side of the cardinal; but, after

the argument had continued for some time, and a good deal of irrelevant matter had been introduced out of the nominalistic and realistic controversy, one of them clinched the matter in Hus's favour by saying, "Why are these irrelevant things introduced, which have nothing to do with matter of faith? He thinks rightly concerning the sacrament of the altar, as he acknowledges." John Stokes then made a final effort against Hus by saying, "When I was at Prague, I saw a treatise ascribed to Hus, in which he laid it down in express terms, that material bread remained in the sacrament after consecration." Hus replied: "Begging your pardon, it is not true."

This was, apparently, the first and only attempt to mingle scholastic questions with theological controversy in the case of Hus. It is clear, therefore, that the nominalistic and realistic dispute had little or no influence on the development of the Hussite movement, whatever may have been its effect upon the various difficulties, which the disputatious Jerome got into in different universities. It was, however, a mean and ill-natured act on the part of Cardinal d'Ailly to take advantage of a philosophical dispute of the schools in order to obtain the conviction of an almost friendless prisoner on the ground of heresy, the sole penalty for which was death. And it is agreeable to find an Englishman recognizing the true nature of the position, and speaking boldly on the side of justice and fair dealing.

But Hus's danger in this respect was not yet over.

Cardinal Zabarella, addressing himself to him, said: "Magister John, you know that it is written, that every word should be established in the mouth of two or three witnesses. And lo! here are full twenty witnesses against you, dignitaries, doctors, and other great and notable men, some of whom depose from hearsay and common report, and others from knowledge, alleging reasonable ground of knowledge; why, then, do you persist in denial against them all?" Hus replied: "If the Lord God and my conscience are my witnesses, that I have neither preached nor taught what they depose against me, nor hath it ever entered into my heart—though all my adversaries depose against me, what can I do? Neither doth this eventually harm me." Cardinal d'Ailly then said: "We cannot judge according to your conscience, but according to things here proved and deduced against you, and some things confessed by you. *You* would, perhaps, wish to term all who depose against you from knowledge, alleging reasonable grounds of knowledge, your enemies and adversaries; *we* must believe them. You said that you entertained suspicions of Magister Stephen Palecz, who has certainly dealt religiously and very humanely with those books and articles, even extracting them in a milder form than they are contained in the book; and similarly with all the other doctors. Nay, you said that you suspected the Chancellor of Paris (Gerson), who is certainly as grave a doctor as can be found in all Christendom."

Here we may observe that it is quite reasonable to say that judges must decide according to the evidence, and not according to the conscience of the prisoner. But in this case, although we hear plenty about evidence against Hus, we hear nothing about evidence in his favour. In all lay courts of justice the prisoner has a right to call witnesses to rebut the evidence for the prosecution, but in this ecclesiastical court the prisoner suspected of heresy was not allowed to clear himself by evidence at all. Nothing could be more iniquitous than the whole proceeding, which was a violation of every principle of honour and justice. But to continue.

It was deposed that the said John Hus had obstinately preached and defended erroneous "articles" of Wycliffe's in the schools and in public sermons. Hus replied that he had neither preached nor did he desire to follow either Wycliffe's or any one's erroneous doctrines, Wycliffe not being his father, nor a Bohemian. If Wycliffe had disseminated errors, let the English see to it. And when it was charged that he had resisted the condemnation of the forty-five "articles" from Wycliffe's writings, he replied that, whereas the doctors condemned the forty-five "articles" on the ground that none of them were catholic, but every one of them was either heretical, erroneous or scandalous, he had not ventured to offend his conscience by consenting to their condemnation. In particular with regard to this: "Pope Silvester and Constantine erred in thus endowing the Church." As regards the follow-

ing: "If a pope or priest be in mortal sin, he doth not make the sacrament, nor consecrate, nor baptize," he qualified the statement by saying that he doth not do such things worthily, but unworthily, being for the time an unworthy minister of God's sacraments." They said, "It stands absolutely in your book." He replied, "I am willing to be burnt if it does not stand as I have qualified it." They afterwards found it standing in this qualified form in the beginning of Chapter II. of the treatise against Palecz. Hus also said that he had not ventured to consent to the condemnation of the statement that: "Tithes are pure alms." Cardinal d'Ailly argued against him thus: "For anything to be alms, it must be given freely and independently of obligation and debt; but tithes being given from obligation and debt, it follows that they are not alms." Hus denied the major proposition of the syllogism, saying, that in a similar case the rich were bound under pain of eternal damnation to the six works of mercy, to clothe the naked, to feed the hungry, etc., yet their gifts were received as alms by the poor. The English Bishop of Salisbury said, "If all are bound to the six works of mercy, it follows that the poor, not having the means of bestowing them, must be subject to damnation." Hus replied that he had made the statement with the qualification, that those who had the means and power of giving were bound by the gospel to give alms under pain of damnation. And he was beginning to explain further how it was free to the first

givers to give tithes as alms, whereas their posterity inherited the obligation to pay them; but he was not allowed to complete his explanation. He also expressly declared that he had not obstinately asserted any of the forty-five "articles," but had with others resisted their condemnation, because he wanted to hear scripture proofs or reasons for it.

It was also deposed that on a certain occasion Hus had said, "Would that my soul might be where that of John Wycliffe is!" He replied that it was true that twelve years ago, before Wycliffe's theological works were brought into Bohemia, when he was much pleased with his philosophical writings, and knew nothing about him save his good life, he had said, "I don't know where the soul of John Wycliffe is; I hope he is saved, and I fear he is damned: nevertheless, in hope I would wish my soul to be where the soul of John Wycliffe is." On this they shook their heads and derided him.

It was also deposed that he had resisted the condemnation of Wycliffe's books, which were condemned at Prague and also in the council at Rome. Hus replied, that being admonished amongst others by the Archbishop of Prague to give Wycliffe's books up to him, he had brought the book himself, and delivered it to the archbishop with the words: "Reverend father, I bring you my books, and wherever you find any error in them, order it to be noted, and I will publish it as such before the whole community." "The archbishop," he continued,

“never pointed out any such passages, but ordered the books to be burnt, which was not in his instructions from the apostolic see.” From that burning and from the sentence and proceedings of the archbishop he admitted that he had appealed to Alexander V., and after his death to John XXIII., now called Balthasar Cossa. No hearing being granted him through his procurators within two years, he had finally appealed to Christ.

When asked whether he had received absolution from Pope John, he answered that he had not; and when further asked whether it was lawful to appeal to Christ, he replied, “I acknowledge here publicly that there is no more righteous and efficacious appeal than to Christ.” This they greatly derided, and he continued: “Whereas to appeal, as the law books say, is, under a grievance from an inferior judge to ask or implore the aid of a superior one: who is a more powerful and righteous judge, and who can better relieve and succour the aggrieved and oppressed than Christ, who neither deceives nor can be deceived?”

It was deposed, that on the next day placards had been posted up in various places, presumably by his order and inducement, that every one was to gird himself with his sword upon his thigh, and not spare his brother or his neighbour. Hus replied that he knew nothing about any such placards or any such thing.

It was also deposed that John Hus had preached divers errors, whence scandals had arisen between

the ecclesiastical dignitaries and the people of the realm of Bohemia and the magisters and students of the University of Prague, with disobedience of inferiors toward their superiors, and the destruction of the University of Prague. He replied that it was not owing to him, but to the refusal of adherence to the king in the matter of neutrality between the rival popes and withdrawal from the obedience of Gregory, that the king had rightfully given the Bohemian nation three votes in the university, and that those who had refused to agree with the king therein had sworn rather to quit the University of Prague than submit to the change. Then, pointing to Albert Warentrape, he said, "This was one of them; he was then Dean of the Faculty of Arts." Warentrape rose and said, "Reverend fathers, that John Hus may not be believed truthful in his narrations and statements, may it please you to hear me!" But he was not heard.

Doctor Naz then rose and said, that King Wenceslas himself had never been favourable to Hus and his associates, but that his favourites had done it all, and had lately maltreated himself (Naz), while under the protection of the king's safe-conduct. Palecz rose and said, that not only foreigners, but also doctors of his own nation, were in exile owing to Hus. To this Hus replied, that this was not true; for he (Hus) was not at Prague when they quitted it.

Here it would appear that a scene of considerable disorder took place, which caused Hus to ex-

claim: "I thought that in this council there would have been more reverence, piety, and good order." All then listened quietly, because the king had commanded a hearing in silence to be given him. Cardinal d'Ailly then said: "Magister John! you spoke lately in the tower more patiently than you are doing now. You must know that this is not in your favour." Hus replied: "Reverend father! it was because they then spoke with me handsomely (*pulchrè*), but here almost all clamour at me; I suppose, therefore, they are all my enemies." The cardinal said: "Who is clamouring? When you speak, they listen to you in silence." Hus answered: "If they did not clamour, orders would not have been given in the king's name and also in yours for silence to be kept under pain of expulsion from this place. Moreover, we are here engaged in a judicial proceeding; others ought to be silent, else I cannot hear what you say."

It was also deposed, that owing to Hus's scandalous and erroneous sermons at Prague a great sedition had ensued, and catholic and God-fearing men had been compelled to quit Prague and conceal themselves outside, and various depredations had been committed upon their property. Hus replied, that it was not owing to him, but to non-adherence to the king and the university in the matter of neutrality between the popes, that Archbishop Zbynek had imposed an interdict for two miles round Prague, had despoiled the tomb of St. Wenceslas and had fled to Raudnitz, followed by the

“prelates” and other clergy, whose property had been interfered with by others, but not by his (Hus’s) order or inducement.

After Dr. Naz and Cardinal d’Ailly had spoken a few words on this subject, the cardinal addressed Hus as follows: “Magister John! when you were brought to the palace, we questioned you as to the manner in which you had come hither, and you said, that you had come freely; and if you had not chosen to come, neither the King of Bohemia nor the King of the Romans could have forced you to do so.” Hus replied: “Yes, I said that I had come freely, and if I had not chosen to come, there are so many and such great lords in Bohemia, who love me, in whose castles I might have remained concealed, that neither the one king nor the other could have compelled me to come hither.” The cardinal shook his head, and with an altered expression of indignation on his countenance, exclaimed: “What audacity!” When the bystanders murmured at this, Lord John of Chlum said to them: “Nay, he speaks the truth, and true it is. I am but a poor knight in our realm, but I would keep him a year, will or nill any one, so that he could not get hold of him. And there are many great lords, who love him, who have very strong castles, who would keep him as long as they pleased, even against both the kings.”

The session now closed for the day, but before Hus was led away, Cardinal d’Ailly said to him: “Magister John! you said lately in the tower, that

you would submit humbly to the judgment of the council. I therefore advise you not to involve yourself as regards these errors, but submit to the correction and instruction of the council, and the council will deal mercifully with you."

The king then said: "Listen, John Hus! Some have said that I did not give you a safe-conduct till you had been a fortnight in prison. I say that this is not true, because I wish to prove by the evidence of the princes and many others, that I gave you a safe-conduct before you quitted Prague, and I also commanded Lords Wenceslas and John to bring you, and make sure that you should not be attacked while coming freely to Constance, but that a public hearing should be given you, that you might answer respecting your belief. This the authorities have done, and have here given you a public, quiet, and honourable hearing, and I thank them for it, although some say that I could not give a safe-conduct to a heretic, or one suspected of heresy. Therefore, as this lord cardinal advises you, even so do I advise you, not to hold aught obstinately, but, in these matters which have been proved against you, and which you have admitted, to surrender yourself entirely to the grace of the sacred council, and they will show you some favour for our sake and our honour, and for the sake of our brother and the realm of Bohemia; and you will undergo penance for the same. But if you *will* hold them obstinately, verily then they will know what to do with you. I have told them that

I will not protect any heretic; nay, if one chose to be obstinate in his heresy, I would light the pile myself unassisted, and burn him. I would advise you to surrender yourself entirely to the mercy of the council, and the sooner the better, that you may not involve yourself in deeper errors." Hus replied to the first part of the king's speech: "I thank your serene highness for the safe-conduct, which you graciously vouchsafed to give me." Others interrupted, and the long-baited and wearied man appearing to forget to make due protestation as to not intending to hold any errors obstinately, Chlum said to him: "Magister John! answer the second part of the king's speech." Hus said: "Most serene prince! let your serene highness be assured, that I came here freely, not to maintain aught obstinately, but to correct it humbly, when shown wherein I have erred."

He was then led back to prison in charge of the bishop of Riga.

We may notice now, that no attempt was made by the council to define any of the matters in question. Hus would have considered it his duty to submit to any definition or decree of the council as regards what was to be believed or held. But he was simply called upon to retract what was articulated or deposed against him, whether he had held it or not. He was to be crushed morally, and thus rendered powerless and innocuous for the future, or that was to be done with him which was eventually done with him. The bearing of these

observations will be more fully seen in the account of the third hearing, in which questions relating to the Church and its constitution were taken into consideration.

Third Day, June 8th.

We now come to what Mladenovitz designates as "the last so-called *hearing*, but rather *jeering*." The king was again present, with cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries, as before; and Lords Wenceslas of Duba and John of Chlum, with their secretary, Peter Mladenovitz, were also present. Thirty "articles" were read consisting of professed extracts from the work "On the Church," seven from the treatise against Palecz, and six from that against Stanislas of Znaym. Those which were honestly extracted Hus at once acknowledged, and, when others were read, which were not in express terms, *in formâ*, in his books, an Englishman, who acted as reader, read the corresponding passages from the copies in Hus's own handwriting. When anything displeasing was read from the books, Cardinal d'Ailly turned to the king and others, saying: "See! what is here written is worse, more dangerous and more erroneous than what hath been articulated." Every now and then Hus made observations upon what was read, which sometimes gave rise to conversations between himself and the cardinals, the most interesting of which I proceed to give in their order.

The 12th article was—(1) "The papal dignity

originated with the Cæsars," which is not in Hus's book; and (2) "The primacy and appointment of the pope emanated from the power of Cæsar," which is in chapter xv. When this was read, along with corresponding passages from the "*De Ecclesiâ*," Hus rose and said: "This is what I affirm, that as regards external adornment and the temporal goods bestowed on the Church, the papal dignity hath origin from the Emperor Constantine, which was afterwards confirmed by other emperors, as is shown by the decree, *dist.* 96; but as regards spiritual administration and the power of ruling the Church spiritually, such dignity arises directly from the Lord Jesus Christ." Cardinal d'Ailly observed: "In Constantine's time a general council was assembled, and that decree was there ascribed to Constantine on account of his presence and the reverence due to him—why, then, don't you say that the pope's primacy emanated from the council, rather than from the power of Cæsar?" Hus replied: "On account of the dotation, as I said, which Cæsar made."

The 15th article ran:—"The vicarial power of the pope comes to nought, unless the pope himself be conformed to Christ or Peter in morals and life; nor doth he otherwise receive procuratorial power from God, since no other sequence more pertinently follows." When this was read along with the corresponding passage from the book, which gives a very different impression, Hus rose and said: "I understand it in this way, that the

power in such a pope comes to nought (*frustratur*), as regards the merit or recompense which he ought to, but doth not, obtain therefrom, but *not* as regards his office." They asked him, "Where is this interpretation (*glossa*) in your book?" He replied, "It is in the second chapter of the treatise against Magister Palecz." They looked at each other and smiled. The passage in the treatise against Palecz, which must be specially noted by my readers, runs as follows: "*We grant that an evil pope, bishop, prelate, or priest, is an unworthy minister of the sacraments, through whom God baptizes, consecrates, or works in other respects for the benefit of his Church.*"

The 17th article was honestly extracted, as follows:—"The cardinals are not the manifest and true successors of the college of the other apostles of Christ, unless they live after the manner of the apostles, keeping the commandments and counsels of the Lord Jesus Christ." The proof thereof was also read from the book: "For if they come up otherwise than by the door of the Lord Jesus Christ, they are thieves and robbers, as the Saviour himself declares, speaking of all such: 'All who have come are thieves and robbers'" (John x.).

Upon this being read, the president, Cardinal d'Ailly, said: "See! it stands worse and more grievously in the book than hath been articulated." Then, turning to Hus, he continued: "You have not observed due limits in your preaching and

writings. But you ought to have adapted your discourses to the requirements of your hearers. Why in preaching to the people was it useful or necessary to preach against the cardinals, none of them being present, whereas such things ought rather to be preached or said in their presence, and not scandalously before laymen?" Hus replied: "Reverend father, it was because priests and other learned men were present at my sermons, that I mooted such things, that present and future priests might be on their guard against them." The cardinal retorted: "You do ill in wishing by such discourses to lower the status of the Church."

Here it must be admitted that the cardinal had, to a certain extent, the better of Hus. If Hus never exceeded the bounds of truth in his invectives, he certainly exceeded those of discipline and respect for his superiors. And Cardinal d'Ailly would naturally consider that such a course was likely to excite revolution from below, which would tend to endanger or obstruct the progress of reform from above, which, there is no doubt, he really had at heart. Still, very little practical stress was placed during the trial upon the subject of ecclesiastical discipline and subordination; the real venue was laid in the region of heresy, in which there would have been no real difficulty in coming to an understanding with Hus, had the council thought fit to define what was to be held or believed upon the points in question. But the authorities at

Constance deemed it necessary to sweep him out of their path in some way or other; his condemnation as a heretic must first be obtained and pronounced, and then they would see what could be done for him.

The 18th article ran:—"Over and above ecclesiastical censure, no heretic ought to be left to a secular tribunal to be punished with the death of the body." This is a shameful concoction, and stands very differently in Hus's work. But as it professes to be extracted from one of the passages, which I have selected to illustrate the style of his Latin writings, I shall content myself with referring the reader to it in its place (ch. xi.), and proceed to give Hus's own remarks upon the subject before the council.

He said: "I assert, that a heretic, who is such, ought first to be fairly, religiously, humbly instructed through the sacred Scriptures, and reasons deduced from them, as was done by St. Augustine and others in their disputations with heretics. But if, after such instruction, he will in no wise desist from his errors, I do not say that such a one ought not to be punished even corporally, but I always assert, that such instruction from the Scriptures ought to precede." This caused a murmur and tumult in the assembly. Then a passage in the book was read, in which he inveighed against those who took violent measures against heretics, saying: "Verily they are herein like the Chief Priests, Pharisees, and Scribes, who said to Pilate: 'It is

not lawful for us to put any man to death,' and delivered Jesus to him. And they are proved to be greater homicides than Pilate by the evidence of Jesus, who said: 'He who delivered Me to thee hath the greater sin.' " A great tumult and murmur then arose, and they shouted to Hus: "Who are like them? Those who deliver a heretic to the secular arm?" Hus, with dauntless courage, replied: "Those who expose an innocent man to death by the secular arm, as did the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees to Christ, delivering him to Pilate." They shouted: "No! no! You are speaking here of doctors." Finally, Cardinal d'Ailly said: "These things are much more grievous than those that are articleed. Verily they have framed their articles religiously."

The 21st article ran: "That a person excommunicated by the pope, if he appeals to Christ, neglecting the judgment of the pope or a general council, is preserved, and such excommunication doth not affect him."

This is not in Hus's work, which, however, contains a justification of his own conduct in appealing to Christ, when unable to obtain a hearing from two successive popes, because he considered, that the further appeal from the pope to a future council would be but "imploping a distant and uncertain aid under a grievance." When this article had been read, he said: "I admit that I appealed to Christ, as aforesaid, in the final instance, when my legal representatives were not

admitted to a hearing for two years or more." Cardinal d'Ailly retorted: "Do you want to be better than St. Paul, who, when aggrieved at Jerusalem, appealed, not to Christ, but to Cæsar?" Hus replied: "Very well; but if one were to do that (*i.e.* appeal to Cæsar) here for the first time, he would be considered a heretic. Moreover, St. Paul did not do this of his own inclination, but by the will of Christ, who appeared to him and said: 'Be firm, for thou must go to Rome.'"

When he was charged with officiating and performing Divine service, while under excommunication, he admitted that he had done so, but under appeal. When asked whether he had obtained absolution from the pope, he acknowledged that he had not, a matter of which special notice was taken by Cardinal Zabarella, who leant forward and ordered his secretary, sitting at his feet, to make a note of it.

The 22nd article ran correctly in Hus's own words: "If a man is vicious and does anything, he acts viciously; if he is virtuous and does anything, he then acts virtuously."

When this and the full passage in which it occurs were read, Cardinal d'Ailly observed: "Yet the Scripture saith, that 'we sin all;' and again, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.' It must, therefore, be the case that we always act viciously." Hus replied: "The Scripture there speaks of venial sins, which do not expel the habit of virtue, but are compatible

with it." Magister William observed: "But those sins are not compatible with a morally good action." Hus cited a passage from Augustine, but was shouted down with the outcry: "What has this to do with the point?"

The 23rd article ran: "A priest of Christ, living according to His law, possessing knowledge of Scripture and capacity to edify the people, ought to preach notwithstanding a pretended excommunication;" and lower down: "If the pope, or other superior, orders a priest so disposed not to preach, he ought not to obey."

Upon this Hus observed: "By a pretended excommunication, I mean one unjust and irregular, issued contrary to due course of law and contrary to God's commandment. A priest so disposed as premised ought not on account of it to cease from fruitful preaching, nor fear such excommunication finally as regards damnation." They answered, by way of objection, that "such an excommunication is a blessing." Hus replied: "True; and I say, moreover, that an excommunication, whereby a man is unjustly excommunicated, is a blessing in the sight of God, according to the statement of the prophet: 'I will curse with your blessings, and bless with your cursings.' And: 'They shall curse, but thou shalt bless.'" Cardinal Zabarella said: "There are, however, rules of law, that even an unjust excommunication is to be dreaded." Hus replied: "True, there being about eight reasons why it is to be dreaded." Cardinal Zabarella con-

tinued: "Are there not more?" Hus replied: "It is in the books that there are more."

We now come to the seven articles extracted with no great honesty from the treatise against Stephen Palecz.

The 1st of these ran: "If a pope, bishop, or dignitary, be in mortal sin, he is not then a pope, bishop, or dignitary."

When this article, with its qualification or limitation, already given at length under article 15 of those extracted from the "De Ecclesia," was read, Hus said: "Yes! neither is one who is in mortal sin worthily a king in the sight of God, as is evident from 1 Kings (1 Sam.) xv., where the Lord said by the prophet Samuel to Saul, who ought to have slain Amalek, and did not do so: 'Because thou hast rejected My Word in not slaying Amalek, I will reject thee from being king.'"

Meanwhile King Sigismund had gone out into a balcony, and was conversing with the Count Palatine of the Rhine and the Burgrave of Nuremberg, telling them that in the whole of Christendom there was not a greater heretic than Hus. As soon as the above statements were made by Hus as to a king and as to Saul, the ecclesiastical dignitaries present shouted: "Call the king!" But as the king was out of earshot, the presidents called to those who were nearer him to bring him in to listen, for Hus was touching upon him. When he came in, they caused Hus to repeat what he had said. When he had finished, and qualified

his statements, Sigismund said : " John Hus ! no man lives without fault." Cardinal d'Ailly, who never lost an opportunity of doing Hus an unfriendly turn, then said to him, with the view of irritating the secular princes against him : " Was it not enough for you to vilify and lower the spiritual estate by your writings and doctrines ? Do you now want to lower the royal estate, and bring kings down from their position ? " Palecz then rose with the intention of proving that Saul was a king, though God had rejected him, and showed how David had forbidden him to be slain, not on account of the holiness of his life, but on account of that of his anointing. And upon Hus citing Cyprian's words : " In vain doth he obtain the name of Christian, who doth not imitate Christ in conduct," Palecz exclaimed : " What fatuity ! What is it to the purpose to allege, that, if a man is not a true Christian, he is therefore not a true pope, bishop, or king ? The learned know, that ' pope,' ' bishop,' ' king,' are names of office, but ' Christian ' is the name of a meritorious thing ; and thus it is incontrovertible, that a man is a true pope, bishop, or king, though he be not a true Christian." After a few words Hus said : " Nay, this was made clear in the case of Pope John XXIII., now called Balthasar Cossa ; if he were a true pope, why was he deposed ? " King Sigismund closed the discussion by observing, that the lords of the council had decided, that Balthasar was a true pope, but on account of his notorious misdemeanours, whereby

he had scandalized the Church and wasted its goods, he was deposed from the papacy.

Here we cannot but remark, that Hus had clearly the worst of this encounter, and that it was his own over-subtilizing that brought him into the difficulty. Still, with the qualification already cited from the treatise against Palecz, his doctrine was perfectly innocuous, and might safely have been left to fall into oblivion with other subtleties and over-refinements.

The 4th article ran: "An evil or 'foreknown' (*præscitus*) pope or dignitary is not truly, but equivocally" (*i.e.* only in one sense of the term) "a shepherd; but is truly a thief and a robber."

Hus observed: "I have thus qualified, and do thus qualify, all such statements, by conceding that such persons, as regards merit, and thus truly and worthily before God, are not proper dignitaries or shepherds; but, as regards their offices and the repute of men, are popes, shepherds, priests, etc."

A black-capped monk from Fürstadt immediately rose behind Hus and said: "My lords! take heed lest Hus deceive both himself and you by those glosses, as if they were in his book. Lately, at a hearing, I replied to him respecting the articles, and said: 'Magister! perhaps those evil popes, etc., are not such as regards merit, but as regards their offices are truly such.' He is now making use of the glosses, which he obtained and heard from me, not that they are anywhere to be found in his books." Magister John turned to

him and said : " Didn't you hear that they are in my book, and have just been read here ? " Then, after some further remarks, he added : " This has been made clear in the case of John, formerly Pope John XXIII., now called Balthasar, whether he was a true pope, or truly a thief and a robber." They looked at each other, and mocked him, saying : " Nay, he was a true pope."

When the 6th article was read, Hus observed : " This is what I mean, that if a pope, or other dignitary, lives contrary to Christ in the vices aforesaid, he enters otherwise, even if humanly elected to such office, since he does not enter into the fold of the Church by the lowly door, which is Jesus Christ. This was manifest respecting Judas, who, though chosen by Christ to his apostleship, nevertheless did not enter by Christ, being a thief, a covetous person, and a son of perdition." Palecz rose and said : " What fatuity ! Judas was chosen by Christ, and yet entered otherwise, and not by Christ ! " Hus replied : " Nay, it is well established, that he was chosen by Christ, yet entered otherwise, being a thief, a devil, and a son of perdition." Palecz rejoined : " Any one may be duly and lawfully elected pope or bishop, and afterwards live contrariwise ; he does not, therefore, enter otherwise." Hus explained his meaning at length : " I say further : whoso enters a bishopric, prelacy, or any benefice whatsoever simoniacally, not with the intention of labouring in the Church of God, but rather with that of living delicately,

voluptuously and luxuriously, and of indulging pride, every such person enters otherwise, since he enters not by the lowly door, which is the Lord Jesus Christ, and, by the evidence of the Gospel, every such person is a thief and a robber."

The 7th article, relating to the condemnation of the forty-five articles extracted from the works of Wycliffe, was constructed in the usual manner, by taking parts of different sentences, connecting and dovetailing them together, so as to form a whole, which could not be accepted without protest by the author of the work from which it professed to be taken.

After this had been read, a passage was also read from the conclusion of the "De Ecclesia," in which certain doctors were rebuked for inconsistency in condemning the doctrine, that ecclesiastical revenues were of an eleemosynary nature, and then petitioning for their restoration in their own case, on the ground of their being of such a nature. Thereupon Cardinal d'Ailly said: "Magister! you stated that you would not defend any error of Wycliffe's, and here it is now manifest from your books, that you have publicly defended those articles. Certainly there are many things set down here which are scandalous and grievous." Hus replied: "Reverend father! as I said before, so I say still, that I will not defend the errors of Wycliffe or any one else. But because it appeared to me contrary to my conscience to consent absolutely to their condemnation without any

scriptural ground against them, I therefore did not think it right to consent to it, especially because the reason alleged, which is a copulative one, cannot be verified in all its parts with regard to every one of them."

In the six articles extracted from the treatise against Stanislas of Znaym, the principal discussion turned on the necessity or non-necessity of a corporeal head of the Church, and of the possibility of its being governed without such head.

Hus argued that at that time there was no such corporeal head, Pope John XXIII. having been deposed, and it might be ever so long before there was one; yet Christ did not cease to govern His Church. He argued further that before the institution of the papacy the apostles governed the Church in things necessary to salvation, and that certainly better than it was governed at the time then present. No reply appears to have been attempted to his arguments, which indeed were very forcible, but Stokes, the Englishman, accused him of vanity in pluming himself upon doctrines which were really not his, but Wycliffe's.

Evidence and articles having now been read, a kind of silence ensued, and Cardinal d'Ailly said: "Magister John, two ways lie before you, of which you must choose one; either to surrender yourself absolutely and entirely to the mercy and into the hands of the council, so as to be content with whatever the council shall determine with regard to you—and the council, from reverence for the King

of the Romans, and his brother, the King of Bohemia, and for your own good, will deal religiously and humanely with you; or, if you still desire to hold and defend some of the articles aforesaid, and wish for another hearing, it will be granted you. But you must know that there are here such great and enlightened men, doctors and magisters, who have such strong reasons against your articles, that it is to be feared you will involve yourself in greater error, if you wish to defend and hold them. I am advising; I am not speaking as a judge." Others added: "Certainly, Magister John, it is better for you, as the lord cardinal says, to surrender yourself entirely to the mercy of the council and hold nothing obstinately." Hus bent his head and answered humbly: "Most reverend fathers, I came here freely, not to defend aught obstinately; but if in some points I have stated things incorrectly or defectively, I wish to submit to the instruction of the council. But I pray, for God's sake, that a hearing may be granted me to explain my meaning as to the articles charged against me, and to cite the writings of holy doctors; and if my reasons and scriptures be not strong enough, I will humbly submit to the instruction of the council." A shout was immediately raised: "He is speaking guardedly and obstinately; he wants to submit to the instruction, and not to the correction and determination of the council." Hus replied: "Nay, I will submit to the instruction, correction, and decision of the council. God is

my witness ; I am speaking sincerely and not guardedly." Cardinal d'Ailly said to him : "Magister John, whereas you desire to surrender yourself to the mercy of the council, you must know that your unanimous instruction from full sixty doctors, some of whom have departed, while those from Paris have just arrived, by the command and commission of the council is this :—(1) That you humbly acknowledge your error in the articles which you have hitherto held ; (2) That you abjure those articles, and swear that you will never more hold or preach them, or put them forth as doctrines ; (3) That you publicly recant and retract those articles ; and (4) That you determine, hold, and preach the contrary to those articles, which, as is here proved against you, you have held, written, and preached."

While wordy missiles were being showered upon him from all quarters, Magister John said : "Most reverend fathers, I am ready to obey the council and receive instruction, but I pray you, for God's sake, not to desire to place the halter of damnation upon me, that I may not be compelled to abjure articles, respecting which, God and my conscience being my witnesses, I know nothing. Witnesses depose things against me which never entered into my heart, especially as regards the doctrine, that material bread remains in the sacrament of the altar after consecration. Those which I do know about, and which I have set down in my books, I will humbly recant, when I have been taught the

contrary. But in abjuring all the articles laid to my charge, many of which have, by God's permission, been falsely ascribed to me, I should by lying prepare the halter of damnation for myself, because 'abjuring,' as I remember reading in the 'Catholicon,' is 'renouncing an error previously held.' But as many articles have been ascribed to me which I have never held, and which have never entered into my heart, it therefore appears to me against my conscience to abjure them and tell a falsehood." They said: "No! no! this is not 'abjuring.'" When he called his conscience to witness, many shouted: "Perhaps your conscience would never tell you that you have erred or were erring." The king then said: "Listen, Hus! why should you refuse to abjure all the erroneous articles of which you speak, because witnesses have deposed wrongfully against you? I am willing to abjure all errors; yet, because I do not wish to hold any error, it is not necessary that I have previously held one." Hus replied: "Lord king! this is not the meaning of the word or verb, 'to abjure.'" Cardinal Zabarella said: "Magister John! a sufficiently qualified formula will be given you with the copies of the articles, under which you will be required to abjure them; and then you will consider what you ought or are willing to do."

The king then said: "John Hus! two ways lie before you: either to abjure and recant the errors here condemned, and surrender yourself to the mercy of the council, and the council will in

some measure be merciful to you ; or, if you choose to defend those errors, the council and doctors have their laws as to what they ought finally to do with you." Hus replied : " Most serene prince ! I do not wish to hold any error, but to submit to the determination of the council, only not to offend my conscience by saying that I have held errors, which I have never held, and which never entered into my heart. I also pray that a hearing may be granted me, merely that I may be able to explain my meaning in certain points and articles charged against me, especially respecting the pope, the heads and members of the Church, wherein they equivocate with me in understanding my meaning ; because I allow and assert, that popes, bishops, dignitaries, etc., if they are foreknown and in mortal sin, are not truly such as regards their merits nor worthily so for the time before God, but are such as regards their office, namely popes, bishops, dignitaries, etc. ; since, as I said, they are unworthy ministers of the sacraments." After a good deal of discussion on both sides, the king said again : " Listen, Hus ! As I told you yesterday, so I tell you to-day ; I cannot repeat it to you ; you are of full age ; if you had chosen, you could have understood it. You now hear that the lords have laid two ways before you, *i.e.* either you must surrender yourself in all respects to the mercy of the sacred council—and that the sooner the better—and abjure all errors, both those written in your books, and also those which you have yourself acknow-

ledged. You must likewise abjure those respecting which sufficient evidence has been adduced against you by persons whom we must believe, because the scripture saith, that every word is to be established in the mouth of two or three witnesses. And here how many more great men have deposed respecting several articles ! You must also undergo penance for those errors, as the council shall dictate to you, with a contrite heart and not with a feigned repentance ; and you must determine and write the contrary to them, and swear no more to hold these or other errors. Or, if you choose obstinately to hold and defend them, the council will certainly proceed against you according to its laws." An old and hoary bishop from Poland said : " The laws are clear in the Clementine constitutions and in Sextus respecting the manner in which heretics ought to be dealt with."

Hus replied to the king : " Most serene prince ! I said before, that I came here freely, not with the intention of holding any error or heresy, but wishing humbly to abide the instruction of the council." A shout was raised : " He is obstinate ! He wants to abide the instruction of the council, and has held those errors many years, and will not submit to the correction and decision of the council so as to recant them." A fat priest, who sat in a window in a costly robe, shouted : " Let him not be admitted to recantation, because, if he does recant, he will not keep it. He sent a letter at his departure to his favourers and adherents, to whom it was

publicly read, stating, that, if he were compelled to recant, he intended to do it with the mouth only and not with the heart. Don't therefore believe him in any wise, for he will not keep it!" Hus answered: "Nay, I will humbly submit to the instruction, correction, and decision of the council; and I made public protestation in my treatise against Magister Stanislas, that I meant humbly to abide the determination of Holy Mother Church, as every faithful Christian ought!" Palecz then rose and said: "If I were to protest ever so much, that I would not slap Magister Albert, who is here sitting beside me, and did nevertheless slap him, what would be the value of my protestation? So you protest that you do not mean to hold or defend any error, especially any error of Wycliffe's." Palecz then read from a paper nine articles from Wycliffe's writings, against five of which Stanislas had preached, and he said that he had himself also preached against them, but Hus and his accomplices had obstinately defended them in the schools and in public. Then turning to Hus he said: "You composed certain writings in their defence, which are here in hand, and if you don't produce your own writings, we will produce them." Hus said: "Produce them." The king said: "If you have such writings, it would be good that you should produce them for the council to consider. If you do not produce them, others will." Hus replied: "Let them produce them."

An article was then exhibited, stating the manner

in which Hus had "glossed" or interpreted a sentence of the pope's. He declared that he had not glossed it, neither had he ever seen the gloss along with the sentence, save in prison in the Dominican convent, when it was shown him by the commissioners. They asked him whether he knew who had composed the gloss, and bade him answer under the oath which he had taken to speak the truth. He said: "I do not know for certain the author of the gloss, but I have heard it was Magister Jesenitz." They rejoined: "Yet in the prison you confessed, that he was the author of the gloss." He answered: "I did so only from hearsay." They asked him whether he approved the gloss, and whether it had been satisfactory to him? He replied: "How could it have been satisfactory to me, when, as I said before, I never saw it?" They asked him further: "Is it satisfactory to you now?" He replied: "No."

After all this baiting and harassing Hus was very pale, and people who knew the fact, said that he had spent the whole previous night without sleep, tormented by toothache and headache, and was already beginning to shake with ague.

An article was then read respecting Hus's alleged conduct in the case of the three young men, who were beheaded by the magistrates of the Old Town of Prague for opposing the sale of indulgences in 1412. He was accused of having caused them to be carried to the chapel Bethlehem and there buried with the chant: *Isti sunt sancti*; of having caused

a mass, *de martyribus*, to be chanted over them the next morning, and of having afterwards in a sermon declared, that he would not give them up for a lump of silver as large as one which he pointed to in the chapel.

Hus replied that it was true that they were thus beheaded, but not true that he had caused them to be carried to their funeral with any such chant, as at that time he was not present.

Dr. Naz then rose and gave a detailed account of the matter, which has already been related at length in Chapter VI. Palecz rose and referred the council to a passage in Hus's "*De Ecclesia*" (cap. 21), in which he alluded to the case. This runs:

"Practical experience explains the meaning of this text (Dan. xi. 33, 34), because, taught by the grace of God, simple laymen and priests teach many by the example of a good life, and rush upon the sword, publicly contradicting the lying word of Antichrist. As is manifest with regard to the laymen, John, Martin and Stasek, who fell upon the sword, contradicting the lying disciples of Antichrist. Others exposed their lives for the truth, and were maltreated, arrested, imprisoned and slaughtered, yet did not deny the truth of Christ, as well priests, as laymen, and women. But some who had joined them withdrew deceitfully; for, daunted by the censures of Antichrist and by the arrests, they turned into the contrary path."

When this was read, the presiding cardinals looked at each other, as if surprised.

The English then produced a copy of a letter in commendation of Wycliffe professing to be from the University of Oxford, which had been brought to Prague, and which they said Hus had publicly read

in a sermon, exhibiting the seal of the university. This Hus admitted, the letter having been brought to Prague by two students, sealed with the seal of the University of Oxford.* The English demanded the names of the students, the letter being a forgery. Hus pointed to Palecz and said: "Yon friend of mine knows the late Nicholas Faulfisch, who brought the letter with another student, who is unknown to me." The English inquired where he was, and Hus replied that he believed him to have died somewhere between Spain and England. Palecz then said: "That Faulfisch was not an Englishman, but a Bohemian. He brought a piece of stone from Wycliffe's tomb, which was afterwards venerated and kept as a relic at Prague. And to all this Hus was privy."

The English then caused a letter of very different tenour with the seal of the Chancellor of the University of Oxford to be read, in which the university requested the condemnation of 260 articles extracted from Wycliffe's writings by twelve grave doctors and great theologians.

Silence now prevailing, Palecz rose and said: "Most serene prince, and most reverend fathers! I call both you and God to witness, that in my proceedings against Hus I have not acted from any jealousy or personal hatred, but only to fulfil my

* Wood, in his "History and Antiquities of Oxford," ascribes this misuse of the university seal to a certain "Petrus Paganus" or "Payne." A person of that name became M.A. of Prague in 1417, and afterwards played an important part in Bohemian history.

oath, as a Doctor of Sacred Theology." Michael de Causis, who sat in front of Hus, rose and said: "I do the same." Hus replied to them: "I stand at the judgment-seat of God, who will judge me and you righteously according to our deserts." Cardinal d'Ailly said, that Palecz and the others had dealt very religiously with the books and the articles extracted from them; for what was in the books was far worse than what they had framed into articles.

The Bishop of Riga then took Hus into his charge, and as he was on his way to prison, Lord John of Chlum greeted him, offered him his hand, and comforted him. Hus felt deeply and gratefully the kindness of his friend, who was neither ashamed nor afraid to offer him his hand in public, after he had been rejected, scorned and pronounced a heretic by all. He afterwards wrote a touching letter to Chlum to that effect.

The session was now over; but, before all had departed, an incident occurred, which was not much noticed at the moment, but which eventually cost Sigismund the crown of Bohemia. The armed men, who were on guard, having retired, Lord John of Chlum, Lord Wenceslas of Duba, and Peter Mladenovitz, went up to the window where the king was. The king apparently did not notice them, but supposed them to have departed, when Hus was led to prison. The king in their hearing addressed the fathers who were still about him as follows:

"Reverend fathers! You have heard that out of the many things which are in his books, and which he has admitted, and

which have been sufficiently proved against him, any one would have been sufficient for his condemnation. If therefore he will not recant and abjure and make statements contrary to those errors, let him be burnt, or do with him as you best know according to your laws. And be sure, whatever promises he makes you as to a wish to recant or as to recantation, not to believe him; nor would I believe him, because he would go to Bohemia and his favourers, and would disseminate more errors, and the last error would be worse than the first. Therefore prohibit him from all further preaching, and even from going any more to his favourers, that he may not disseminate his errors more. And send the articles here condemned to my brother in the land of Bohemia, and alas! to Poland and other lands, where Hus already has many secret disciples and favourers. And let the bishops and dignitaries in those lands punish all who are found holding them, that the branches may be torn up along with the root. And let the council write to kings and princes to be more graciously disposed towards their prelates, who have laboured diligently in the sacred council for the extirpation of those heresies. You know too, that it is written, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word is to be established; but here the hundredth part would have been sufficient for his condemnation. Therefore make an end also with his other secret disciples and favourers, because I am soon about to depart, and especially with that, that"—repeating the word "that"—"fellow, who is detained here in prison." They said: "Jerome?" He said, "Yes, Jerome." "We'll make a finish with him in less than a day. It will be an easier matter, for the other is the master and that Jerome his scholar." The king resumed: "Verily I was still young when that sect arose and began in Bohemia, and see to what magnitude it has grown and multiplied!"

After this conversation they all retired to their several abodes rejoicing.

Here it is to be observed, that Sigismund traced

the movement—which, so far, had culminated in Hus—to his precursors Milicz and Mathias of Janow, an account of whom is thus manifestly with propriety prefixed to the biography of Hus. It is also to be noticed, that it was not so much the fact, that Sigismund—after once condoning the violation of his safe-conduct—did not protect Hus against condemnation and execution as a heretic by the council, that the Bohemians took to heart, as his deliberate faithlessness in first luring him to Constance by promises of protection and assistance, and then, instead of interceding for him, urging the already exasperated fathers to his destruction.

The unintentional hearers of the conversation made no secret of what they had heard, either to Hus, who felt it bitterly, or to their countrymen, so that what was spoken in a corner in the Franciscan refectory soon became known throughout the length and breadth of Bohemia. What trust could henceforward be placed in such a king? How would the rights and liberties of the Bohemians fare, when such an heir presumptive came to sit upon their throne?

The die was now cast on the part of the council, which had evidently acted throughout in a thoroughly hostile spirit towards Hus. It was not his instruction or correction, but his condemnation that had been aimed at from the first. His conscience was not to be a factor in the proceedings; the authority of the council was to be all in all. But from that time forth the individual conscience

began to be a factor of serious import in the constitution of society, and as time went on, gained greater and greater power. Hus may be looked upon as the protomartyr of conscience, conscience in opposition to mere authority ; and ere long we shall see authority all but supplicating conscience to waive her claims and yield the desired submission.

CHAPTER X.

JOHN HUS'S CONDEMNATION AND MARTYRDOM.

THE champion of conscience was now in his cell, condemned by authority, but the struggle was not yet over. Authority did not wish to have blood on her hands, if she could but obtain the submission and concessions which she deemed needful. Besides, the path of bloodshed was not without danger, a significant hint whereof had just arrived. After the conclusion of Hus's public hearings, the letter of the Bohemian lords to Sigismund completed its journey to Constance and was read in the session of the council on June 12th. No less than two hundred and fifty seals were attached to it; nor could such a document fail to cause some sensation in the assembly. An attempt was made by Palecz to lessen its effect by drawing attention to the fact that King Wenceslas had not participated in it, but the counter-fact also stood out in sharp relief, that neither had Wenceslas sent an ambassador to the council, remaining indeed as far removed from its proceed-

ings, as Sigismund had been from those of the council of Pisa. Still neither did this letter of the Bohemian nobles to the king, nor that of the University of Prague to the cardinals, which arrived along with it, containing intercessions for both Hus and Jerome, produce any eventual effect upon the proceedings, beyond perhaps causing a certain amount of delay and increasing the solicitude of authority to obtain submission rather than have recourse to the secular arm.

True, a council, which had deprived three popes of their high position, and had proclaimed its power superior to that of any pope, could not possibly accept the definition of the Church given by Hus's adversaries, viz. that the Church was that of which the pope was the head and the cardinals the body. Nor, if it had thought fit to issue an authoritative definition, is there any reason to doubt that it would have been humbly and gratefully accepted by Hus. But then authority would have had in some measure to descend from her throne, and the submission of the so-called heretic would not have been sufficiently complete; the movement below would have exerted an unmistakable influence upon the decision arrived at above. Hus was ready to receive instruction and to submit to the decision of the council, but the council would neither condescend to instruct him nor to give its decision upon the points in question; it simply called upon him to submit to AUTHORITY and abjure everything, true or false, that had been laid to his charge. Could con-

SCIENCE be satisfied with such an ending? Could conscience retract truths that she had held and falsehoods that she abhorred in the selfsame breath? Could such a grovelling in the dust at the feet of authority be satisfactory in the sight of the Most High, whom conscience had endeavoured honestly to serve? Conscience might have been mistaken in some things, and upon these she would gladly have received instruction, but in the main she felt that she was in the right and righteous, and that she was being dealt with falsely, insincerely, and impiously. She therefore held her own, and in default of either instruction for herself or decisions universally binding for the future, refused to abjure the medley of garbled articles and false charges, which she was required to recant. The stake and the flame were better in her eyes than the gnawing worm of remorse, which a lie, spoken deliberately in the face of the Most High, would have introduced into her being, it might be, for ever and ever.

Although in Hus's last public hearing the authorities had promised to allow him a further audience should he desire it, yet this promise was never fulfilled. King Sigismund had also promised that a copy of the articles of accusation should be given him, in order that he might briefly reply to them. It was very important in Hus's eyes, that written evidence of his sentiments in these respects should remain after him, and he wrote an earnest letter from prison to Chlum, begging that all the Bohemian lords in Constance would betake themselves

in a body to the king and council, and demand the fulfilment of this promise. They did so, and their request was granted. The council in its session on June 18th determined to place in Hus's hands a brief statement of the articles against him, to which he wrote answers in the course of the two following days. But this had no effect upon the subsequent course of proceedings.

The council had already caused the question of the reception of the eucharist by the laity under both kinds to be examined into by a number of Doctors of Theology and Law, and issued its decision on June 15th, which was substantially this :

“That, although the sacrament had originally been received in both kinds, yet on reasonable grounds a custom had been introduced of administering it to the laity under the form of bread only, which was sufficient; that, therefore, this custom was to be established as a law, and this law could not be arbitrarily rejected or altered without the consent of the Church; to do so was an error, and whoever persisted obstinately in an error was a heretic.”

At the same time the council issued orders to all archbishops and bishops to smite the introducers of this error, if they would not desist from it, with ecclesiastical punishments as heretics, and to use, if requisite, the aid of the secular arm. Shortly afterwards the council also gave sentence against Hus's treatises and books, both Latin and Bohemian, the former of which they were able, and the latter of which they were unable, to read, decreeing that they should be burnt, as containing errors.

With Hus himself negotiations were carried on privately as to the manner and form in which he was to recant in order to satisfy the council. One of the leading members of the council (formerly supposed on insufficient grounds to have been Cardinal John di Brogni, Bishop of Ostia), who is referred to by Hus himself as "the father" (*Pater*), and who seems to have really been favourably inclined towards him, composed a formula for the purpose, intended to smooth the way for his recantation of errors falsely ascribed to him, which ran as follows :

"I, such a one, etc. Over and above the protests made by me, which I wish to consider here repeated, I protest anew, that though many things are laid to my charge, which I never thought of, nevertheless, as regards all things laid to my charge or objected against me, whether extracts from my books or also the depositions of witnesses, I humbly submit myself to the ordinance, decision, and correction of the holy general council, to abjure, to revoke, to retract, to undergo merciful penance, and to do all and singular, that the said holy council shall mercifully and according to its grace deem proper to be ordained for my salvation, recommending myself most devoutly to the same."

To this Hus replied :

"May the most wise and righteous Father Almighty deign to grant eternal life and glory to my 'father' for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake! Reverend father! I am very grateful for your pious and paternal favour. I dare not submit myself to the council according to the tenour of the recantation exhibited to me, both because I must condemn many truths, which, as I heard from themselves, they designate scandalous, and because I must incur the guilt of perjury by abjuration through admit-

ting that I have held the errors; whereby I should greatly scandalize God's people, who have heard the contrary from me in my preaching. If then the holy Eleazar, a man of the old law, an account of whom is in the Book of the Maccabees, would not lyingly admit that he had eaten flesh forbidden by the law, lest he should act against God and leave an evil example to posterity, how should I, a priest of the new law, though an unworthy one, for fear of a punishment which will soon be over, be willing to transgress the law of God more grievously, (1) by withdrawing from the truth; (2) by committing perjury; (3) by scandalizing my neighbours? Indeed, it is better for me to die, than, avoiding a momentary punishment, to fall into the hands of the Lord, and perhaps afterwards into fire and everlasting reproach. And because I have appealed to Christ Jesus, the most powerful and the most righteous of judges, committing myself and my cause to Him, I therefore await His decision and sentence, knowing that He will judge every man, not according to false or erroneous witness, but according to truth and deserving."

The "father" did not give up his attempt to persuade Hus to submit to the council in the only manner in which it was willing to receive his submission, but rejoined:

"As regards the first point, most loving and beloved brother! let it not affect you, that you would be condemning truths, because it is not you, but those who are your superiors, and at the present time ours also, who are the condemners. Attend to this word: Do not rely on your own wisdom; there are many scientific and conscientious men in the council. My son! hear the law of thy mother! This as to the first point.

"As regards the second, concerning perjury. If it be perjury, it would not redound upon you, but on those who require it. Also, they are not heresies as regards yourself upon the cessation of obstinacy. Augustine, Origen, the Master of Sentences, etc., erred and gladly returned. I have often believed myself

to have understood some things well, in which I have fallen short ; when corrected, I returned with joy.

“I am writing briefly, because I am writing to one who understands. You will not depart from the truth, but approach to the truth ; neither will you make matters worse, but better ; you will not scandalize, but edify. Eleazar was a glorious Jew, more glorious was the Jewish widow with seven sons and eight martyrs ; nevertheless Paul was let down in a basket to effect better things. The Lord Jesus, the Judge of your appeal, gives you apostles, and these are they. Still greater contests will be given you for the faith of Christ.”

This was ingeniously argued by the “father,” but Conscience felt that it was but playing fast and loose with truth. Hus therefore finally replied :

“The council has frequently made all these demands from me ; but because they imply that I am to recant, abjure, and undertake penance with regard to matters in which I must depart from many truths ; (2) because I must abjure, and thus be a perjured man by confessing with regard to myself errors falsely laid to my charge ; (3) because I should thereby scandalize much people of God, to whom I have preached ; wherefore it would be better that a millstone were placed upon me and I were sunk in the depth of the sea ; and (4) because, if I were to do this, desiring to escape a brief confusion and punishment, I should fall into the greatest confusion and punishment, if I did not repent most seriously before death. Therefore for my encouragement I call to mind the seven Maccabæan martyrs, who preferred to be cut in pieces rather than eat flesh contrary to the law of the Lord. I call to mind also the holy Eleazar, who, as is there written, refused merely to *say* that he had eaten flesh forbidden by the law, lest he should give an evil precedent to posterity, but in preference underwent martyrdom. How then ought I, having these before my eyes, as well as many holy men and women of the new law, who gave themselves up to martyrdom, refusing to consent to sin—how ought I, who have

for so many years preached of constancy and faith, to fall into many falsehoods and perjury and scandalize many sons of God? Far be it from me, because Christ the Lord will most abundantly recompense me, giving me patience at the present and glory in future!"

This was decisive, and it was now plain, that Hus would never consent to an indefinite recantation, in which the matters recanted were left uncertain; neither would he recant what he had hitherto held to be true, unless better instructed from Scripture, or unless a definite decree on the points in question were issued by the council. He had dedicated his life and all his powers to the promotion of a true and searching reform of the Church, and he would not take upon his conscience the responsibility of the perplexity and confusion which would arise amongst his followers in Bohemia, and of the injury which would be done to this great end and object of his life, if he made the kind of recantation which the council demanded.

Other members of the council visited him in his prison, and endeavoured to persuade him, that the recantation of errors did not necessarily contain the acknowledgment of having held them. Hus told them, that he would gladly recant by declaring that he had never held or taught, and would never hold or teach, any such errors. To this they made no reply, well knowing that the majority of the council would not be satisfied with such a recantation. Stephen Palecz also counselled him to recant. Hus had requested the commissioners to grant him

a confessor, and had expressed a wish that Palecz might be selected for the purpose, even for the very reason that Palecz had been his greatest adversary. Another confessor was assigned him, a monk and doctor, who listened to his confession "piously and very handsomely, absolved and advised him without imposing any penance, as others recommended." When Palecz, who visited the prison at Hus's own request, endeavoured to persuade him to abjure, Hus asked him plainly what he would do himself, if he knew for certain that he had not held the errors ascribed to him? Palecz answered: "'Tis difficult," and began to weep. Hus also requested Palecz to forgive him for having designated him a "concoctor" of names (*fictor*) in his treatise against him, and over this again they wept together.

It is also to be noticed, that in his Latin letters, written after his trial, Hus several times entreats his friends not to entrust them to the care of any cleric. Michael de Causis had made such arrangements, that no one was admitted in front of the prison, nor were even the wives of the warders allowed entrance. Michael himself—"poor fellow," as Hus calls him—came several times with the commissioners deputed to confer with Hus, and told the warders: "By God's grace we shall soon burn that heretic, on whose account I have expended many florins." "Be assured," writes Hus, in a letter to his friends at Constance, "that I do not in thus writing wish for vengeance upon him,

which I have committed to God, and I pray God earnestly for him."

On July 1st, a commission of eight, with John Wallenrode, Archbishop of Riga, at their head, entered Hus's prison, and demanded a final answer from him. Hus replied, in writing, that he could not recant all the articles charged against him by witnesses, lest he should incur the guilt of perjury, they being founded upon false evidence. But, as regarded the articles extracted from his own writings, he rejected everything incorrect that was in them, but did not intend to abjure each and all of them for fear of condemning truth. His views in these respects are already set forth at large in his own words in his correspondence with the "father," and need not be restated here.

Ever after his last public hearing in the council on June 8th, Hus had contemplated death, expecting his sentence from day to day, but always with a calm and resolute mind. On June 10th, he wrote a letter intended for general perusal to all "faithful Bohemians," and others on June 24th and 26th, all in the Bohemian language. In the Bohemian letters he does not mention the decree of the council condemning the administration of the chalice to the laity. But in a Latin letter, addressed to his friends at Constance, he speaks very freely on the subject, as follows :

"As I think, there will be a great persecution in the land of Bohemia of those who serve God faithfully, if God doth not apply his hands through the secular lords, whom He has

enlightened in His law more than the spiritual ones. O, what madness! To condemn, as an error, the Gospel of Christ, the Epistle of Paul, which he says he received not from men, but from Christ, and the act of Christ along with the acts of His apostles, and other saints! That is to say, as to the communion of the sacrament of the cup, which was appointed for all adult believers. Behold! they call it an error, that faithful laymen are allowed to drink of the cup of the Lord, and say that if any presbyter thus gives them to drink, he is to be considered as in error, and unless he desists, is to be condemned as a heretic! O Saint Paul! thou sayest to all believers: 'As oft as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, ye will show forth the death of the Lord until He come,' *i.e.* until the day of judgment in which He will come; and behold! it is now said, that the custom of Rome is in opposition thereto."

To the same effect he wrote to his second coadjutor at Bethlehem, the priest Havlik (Gallus), urging him, but in vain, not to oppose communion in both kinds. He says:

"Most beloved brother Gallus, preacher of Christ's word! do not oppose the sacrament of the cup of the Lord, which Christ instituted by Himself and by His Apostles; because no Scripture is against it, but only custom, which, I think, established itself through negligence. Only we ought not to follow custom, but Christ's example, and the truth. The council, alleging custom, has already condemned the communion of the cup, so far as the laity are concerned, as an error; and he who practises it, unless he repent, will be punished as a heretic. See the wickedness! They are already condemning Christ's institution as an error! I pray you, for God's sake, no more to impugn Magister Jacobellus, lest there be a rent among the faithful, whereat the devil will rejoice. Likewise, my dearest friend! prepare yourself for suffering in the eating and in the communion of the cup, and stand bravely in the truth of Christ, disregarding unlawful fear, encouraging other brethren in the Gospel of the

Lord Jesus Christ. I suppose they will give you the reasons for the communion of the cup, which I have written at Constance. Salute Christ's faithful ones. Written in chains, on the vigil of the 10,000 soldiers " (June 21st).

Among the friends to whom he bade farewell by letter, Hus addressed himself with especial gratitude to his two protectors at Constance, Lords John of Chlum and Wenceslas of Duba, advising them both to quit the slippery service of the court, and serve God in the quiet of home and domestic life, which to his great comfort they both promised to do. And as John of Chlum was not a wealthy man, and had by his long sojourn at Constance, on Hus's account, incurred expenses far beyond his means, Hus expressed earnest hopes, that wealthier friends would unite to reimburse him.

Before his departure from Bohemia, Hus had entrusted a sealed letter to his beloved pupil and afterwards assistant at Bethlehem, Magister Martin of Volyne, which was not to be opened till the fact of his death was certain. In it he gave him tender and kindly exhortations and rules of life, confessing several weaknesses of his own, and urging him not to imitate them. He also gave certain directions as to the disposal of his little property. With similar intent he wrote to him from prison on June 16th, 1415, adding last messages for various friends. To Magister Christian of Prachatitz he wrote, exhorting him to persevere in the defence of the truth, in his customary virtues, in goodness to the poor and in purity. And, as Magister

Christian had two years previously been thinking of resigning his rectory of St. Michael's, he begged him to do no such thing, "that the faithful might betake themselves to him for refuge, as to an affectionate father." He also requested him to greet Magister Jacobellus "and all the friends of the truth."

On June 27th he wrote a farewell letter to the university, to the magisters, bachelors, and students, urging them to concord and steadfastness, and giving them an account of his conduct in relation to the recantation required of him by the council. He specially recommended Peter Mladenovitz to their love as his "most faithful and constant consoler and comforter," expressing also a wish that Havlik should succeed him at Bethlehem. Of Magister Jerome of Prague, "the Whiskerandos (*Barbatus*) who would not hearken to friendly counsels," he made affectionate mention in several letters, prophesying Jerome's death as well as his own. Magister John of Jesenitz he strongly recommended to enter into the holy estate of matrimony.

With regard to his little property, Hus gave all needful directions to Magister Martin of Volyne and Peter Mladenovitz. To themselves he left some of his books, while others he gave to other friends in the university. Peter Mladenovitz was to take some of his copies of Wycliffe's works and a fur coat. He also made special mention of two young clerics who had attended upon him at Bethlehem, wishing it had been in his power to

do more for them. His brothers he commended to Magister Martin, to whom he also entrusted his brother's sons, suggesting that their attention should be turned to trade or handicraft, as they did not appear suited for the clerical profession. He lamented that he was unable to satisfy all his creditors, especially those who had lent him money for his journey to Constance, recommending them to the recompense of God, but withal expressing a hope that the richer among them would contribute together and reimburse the poorer. To Lord John of Chlum he bequeathed his horse and carriage, if still remaining.

It is not known for certain whether King Wenceslas actually took any steps on behalf of Hus during his imprisonment at Constance or no. There is, however, a note in the subsidy book of the New Town of Prague, which makes it appear probable that he did so. It is certain that the king was much grieved at his fate. Hus requested his friends to express his thanks to both King Wenceslas and Queen Sophia for having been so gracious to him and exerted themselves so much to obtain his liberation. He even, in his Christian humility and forgiveness, thanked Sigismund, who had lured him to Constance and then condemned him before his enemies had done so.

After the decided answer given by Hus to the commissioners of the council on July 1st, it could no longer be doubted what manner of end his case must have. The council determined upon his

condemnation. Nevertheless, at the request of Sigismund, on July 5th, Lords Wenceslas of Duba and John of Chlum went with four bishops to the Franciscan convent, where he was imprisoned, to hear his final determination, authority thus making a last effort to avoid embruing her hands in blood. That noble and true-hearted man, John of Chlum, said to Hus, when led out of his prison to meet them : " See ! Magister John ! we are laymen and cannot advise you ; look, therefore, if you feel yourself guilty in any of the matters laid to your charge, that you fear not to be instructed with regard to them and to recant. If, however, your conscience tells you that you are not guilty, do not in any wise act against your conscience or lie in the sight of God, but rather stand even unto death in the truth which you have known." Hus replied meekly with tears : " Lord John ! be assured that if I knew myself to have written or preached aught erroneous against the law and against Holy Mother Church, I would humbly recant it ; God is my witness. But I always desire that they would show me better and more probable scriptures than are the things which I have written and taught ; and if they be shown me, I will most readily recant." On this one of the bishops replied : " Do you want to be wiser than the whole council ? " Hus rejoined : " I do not want to be wiser than the whole council ; but, I pray, give me one of the least in the council to instruct me with, better and stronger scriptures, and I am ready to recant at once."

The bishops vouchsafed no further answer than the words : " See ! how obstinate he is in his heresy ! " ordered him to be conducted back to prison, and took their departure.

The next day, July 6th, a scene never to be forgotten took place in Constance. The council held its fifteenth grand session, one of the most magnificent and important of all, in the cathedral. The King of the Romans, Sigismund, was present, sitting upon his throne with the insignia of the imperial dignity. At his side the Count Palatine, Louis, held the imperial globe ; Frederic, Burgrave of Nuremberg, the sceptre ; Henry, Duke of Bavaria, the crown ; and a Hungarian magnate the sword. Cardinal di Brogni presided, and the other cardinals and prelates sat together in full number. In the midst of the cathedral rose a little platform, in which was fixed a post, whereon hung the vestments worn by a priest in celebrating mass. A solemn mass was read by the Bishop of Gnesen, during which the prisoner was detained at the door amidst armed men. Nor was he admitted till the Bishop of Lodi ascended the pulpit, when Hus came forward and knelt in prayer beside the platform. The bishop preached upon Rom. vi. 6 : " That the body of sin may be destroyed : " and entered upon the subject of heresy at large, dwelling particularly on the heresy of simony, and urging the king, as a part of his kingly duty, " to repair the rent church, to remove inveterate schisms, to restrain simonists, and to extirpate heretics." " Destroy,"

he continued, "heresies and errors, and especially this obstinate heretic, through whose malignity many localities in the world are infected with the plague of heresy and owing thereto destroyed!"

As soon as business began, proclamation was made in the name of the council, that, under pain of excommunication and two months' imprisonment, no one, whoever he might be, should venture to interrupt the proceedings either by speaking or contradicting, or by exhibiting tokens of approbation or disapprobation. Then were read some of the 260 erroneous articles extracted by the University of Oxford from the writings of Wycliffe, and sentence was passed upon them. The case of Hus came next in order. The papal auditor, Berchtold of Wildungen, first read thirty "articles" extracted from his writings, the accusations proved by witnesses, and the whole course of the proceedings taken against him. Hus endeavoured to justify himself and to state the limitations with which he had qualified the obnoxious passages, but was not allowed to do so. Cardinal d'Ailly told him to hold his tongue; he would afterwards be able to answer the articles all at once. "How can I do this," cried Hus, "when I cannot even bear them all in mind?" When he endeavoured to reply to other articles, as they were read out, Cardinal Zabarella said: "Hold your tongue; we have already given you a sufficient hearing;" turned to the beadles and bade them order him to be silent. Hus clasped his hands and with a loud voice implored a hearing

for God's sake, that the bystanders might not believe him to have held errors ; they might afterwards do what they pleased with him. When forbidden to speak or reply to the charges, he clasped his hands, raised his eyes to heaven, and prayed devoutly.

The articles proved by the depositions of witnesses were dishonestly and unfairly read, the offices and localities only, and not the names of the deponents, being given. When charged with holding, that material bread, or the substance of bread, remained in the sacrament after consecration, Hus rose again and endeavoured to reply, but was shouted down by Cardinal Zabarella. Nevertheless he cried out, "I pray you, for God's sake, hear my meaning, and for the sake of those present, that they may not believe me to have held those errors. Wherefore I say that I have never held, taught or preached, that in the sacrament of the altar, material bread remains after consecration." He gave similar replies to other long refuted charges.

They now proceeded to charge him with a monstrous "article," which had never been mentioned before. It was a most wicked and malicious invention, simply intended to cover the slightness of the genuine causes of complaint that they had against him on the score of heresy. It runs according to the printed "Acta" of the council:—

"That Magister John Hus granted this proposition, that John Hus was a person in the Godhead, and that there were more persons than three in the Godhead ; proved to be true by

one Doctor of Theology from common report and fame, by one abbot from common fame, and by a vicar of the cathedral at Prague, who said he had heard it from the mouth of John Hus as articulated."

No wonder that Hus exclaimed: "Let that doctor be named who has given this evidence against me!" No wonder that he loudly stated his honest faith in catholic doctrine, from which it had never entered into his heart to vary!

When it was read that Magister John Hus had appealed to God, and that such an appeal was condemned as an error, he replied with a loud voice: "O Lord God! Lo! this council now condemns Thy actions and law as an error! Who, when Thou wast aggrieved and oppressed by Thine enemies, committedst Thy cause to God Thy Father, the most righteous of Judges, giving herein an example to us poor wretches, when aggrieved in whatever way, to have recourse to Thee, the most righteous of Judges, humbly asking Thine aid." He added moreover: "And I affirm, that there is no safer appeal than that to the Lord Jesus Christ, Who is not bent by bribery nor deceived by false witness, but assigns his deserts to each."

It was also read, that Hus had behaved contumaciously under excommunication. He replied: "I did not take the excommunication contumaciously, but preached and celebrated mass under appeal. And though I sent two sets of procurators to the Roman Curia, alleging reasonable grounds of non-appearance personally, I could never obtain

a hearing, but some of my procurators were imprisoned and others maltreated." In proof of this he referred to the official records of the case, and then proceeded to repeat with emphasis a statement, which he had already several times made before the council: "Moreover, I came here freely to this council, with a safe-conduct from my lord the king here present, with the wish to prove my innocence and give an account of my belief." As Hus said this, fixing his eyes on the king, a manifest blush overspread Sigismund's countenance, a blush to which Sigismund's successor, Charles V., declined to render himself liable, when urged at the Diet of Worms to violate the safe-conduct he had given to Luther.

When all the charges had been read, the Bishop of Concordia proceeded to read the final sentence (1) against Hus's books, and (2) against Hus himself. The books, whether in Latin or in Bohemian, were condemned to the flames; and Hus was proclaimed a manifest heretic for preaching erroneous, scandalous, and seditious doctrines, leading a multitude of people astray, injuring the honour of the Holy See and the Church, and hardening himself in his malice; wherefore he was to be degraded from the priesthood, deprived of the consecration which he had received, and delivered over to the secular arm, as the Church had nothing further to do with him.

When pronounced "obstinate in his error and heresy," Hus dauntlessly cried with a loud voice: "I never was nor am I obstinate, but have always

desired and do this day desire more effectual instruction from the scriptures. And this day I say, that, if by one word I could destroy and confute all errors, I would most gladly do so." When all his books, whether written in Latin or in Bohemian, or translated into any other language, were condemned and ordered to be burnt as suspected of heresy, he replied: "How do you condemn my books, when I have always desired and asked for better scriptures against the statements and positions in them, and you have never up to this time brought a passage of scripture against them, nor shown a single word to be erroneous? And how have you condemned the books translated (*sic*) into the vulgar Bohemian or any other language, which you have never seen?" But when the sentence against himself was read, he knelt and listened, praying and looking upwards towards heaven. When the whole of the sentence had been read, Hus knelt again and prayed with a loud voice for all his enemies, saying: "Lord Jesus Christ! pardon all my enemies, I pray Thee, for the sake of Thy great mercy. Thou knowest that they have falsely accused me, brought forward false witnesses, and concocted false articles against me. Pardon them for the sake of Thy infinite mercy!" These affecting and truly Christian prayers were received, especially by the "chief of the priests," with anger and derision.

The Archbishop of Milan and six other bishops were appointed to degrade and de-consecrate him. By their orders he was dressed in the altar-vest-

ments of a celebrant. As he put on the alb, he said, "My Lord Jesus Christ was mocked in a white robe, when conducted from Herod to Pilate." Being vested and exhorted by the bishops to abjure, he stepped on the platform, turned sadly to the assembly and said with tears: "See! these bishops exhort me to recant and abjure. I fear to do so, lest I should be a liar in the sight of God; lest I should offend my conscience and God's truth, never having held the articles which they falsely testify against me, but rather having taught, written, and preached the contrary; and also lest I should offend and scandalize the great multitude to whom I have preached, and likewise others who are faithfully preaching the Word of God." On his saying this, the principal ecclesiastics sitting round and other members of the council observed: "We now see how hardened he is in his malice and how obstinate in his heresy."

When he came down from the platform the seven bishops aforesaid began the ceremony of his degradation, first taking the chalice from his hands and repeating the following curse: "O cursed Judas! since thou hast forsaken the counsel of peace and taken counsel with the Jews, we take from thee this cup of redemption." But Hus said with a loud voice: "I trust in the Lord God Almighty, for whose Name's sake I patiently suffer this blasphemy, that He will not take from me the cup of His Redemption. And I steadfastly hope that I shall drink it this day in His kingdom." Then

they took from him the other vestments, pronouncing a curse at each "after their fashion," while he replied that he humbly and willingly accepted those blasphemies for the Name's sake of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The next proceeding was the destruction of his tonsure. Here an altercation ensued amongst them, some wishing to destroy it with a razor, while others said that it was sufficient to "violate" it with scissors. During this Hus turned to the king and said: "See! these bishops cannot agree in this blasphemy." They eventually cut his tonsure with scissors in four directions, to the right, to the left, in front and behind, saying words to this effect: "The Church has now deprived him of all rights, she has now nothing more to do; he must therefore be delivered over to the secular arm."

Before they placed the paper crown of blasphemy on his head, they said to him, amongst other things: "We commit thy soul to the devil." Hus clasped his hands together, raised his eyes to heaven, and said: "And I commit it to the righteous Lord Jesus Christ." When he espied the crown, he said: "My Lord Jesus Christ, for my sake, wretch that I am, deigned guiltless to bear a much harder and more grievous crown of thorns to a most shameful death; therefore I, wretch and sinner that I am, am willing humbly to bear this much lighter, though blasphemous one, for His Name and the truth's sake." It was a circular sugar-loaf-shaped crown of paper, about

an ell high, on which were painted three terrible devils, tearing a sinful soul, with the inscription: "This is an Heresiarch." The crown being finally placed on Hus's head, the king turned to the Count Palatine with these words: "Go, take him." The count immediately laid aside the imperial globe, took the prisoner into his charge, and delivered him to the magistrates of Constance, saying: "Take John Hus, who, according to the decree of our most gracious lord the king, and by command of the council, is to be burned as a heretic."

No delay took place in the execution of these orders. The council proceeded with its business, while Hus was led out of the cathedral and out of the city to the place of execution. He was escorted by a body of about one thousand men-at-arms, and followed by a vast throng of spectators. As he issued from the cathedral, he saw his books blazing in the churchyard, and smiled at the sight. He walked to death with a firm and steady step, chanting or praying, without exhibiting the slightest sign of fear or regret. So large a procession could not move rapidly, and from time to time a stoppage occurred, of which Hus took advantage to address the bystanders, to explain his position, and to assure them of his innocence. But the crowd of common people was not allowed to follow him beyond the city gates, grieving as it appeared to be at the cruel death of an innocent man.

The place of execution was a meadow among

gardens, on the way from Constance to Gottlieben. Some of the laity present said : "What and what manner of things he hath done or said formerly, we know not ; but now we see and hear that he prayeth and speaketh holy words." Others cried, that a confessor ought to be assigned him ; and a priest on horseback, in a green frock lined with red silk, replied : "Being a heretic, he ought not to be heard, neither ought a confessor to be assigned him." When he came up to the stake, he fell on his knees and prayed, chanting the thirty-first and fifty-first Psalms, and especially repeating the sixth verse of the latter : "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit ; for Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, thou God of truth." As he prayed, the cap of blasphemy fell from his head, at which he smiled, and some of the hirelings round about said it ought to be replaced, that he might be burned along with the devils that he had served. A confessor eventually offered himself upon condition of his recantation, but Hus declined his services on any such terms. Rising from prayer, he said with a loud and distinct voice : "O Lord Jesus Christ ! I am willing patiently and humbly to endure this dreadful, shameful, and cruel death for the sake of Thy Gospel and the preaching of Thy Word." He was then led round, as a spectacle, and made use of the opportunity to beg the bystanders not to believe that he had in any wise held, preached, or taught the articles laid to his charge by false witnesses. He was not allowed to address the by-

standers further, but permitted to take leave of his prison-warders, which he did in German in very friendly and affectionate terms. He was then stripped of his clothes, with the exception of his boots, which could not be removed, as his feet were fettered together. At first his face was turned towards the east, which displeased some of the bystanders, who cried out that such a heretic ought not to be allowed to face the east, but ought to be turned round towards the west, and the change was accordingly made. When a foul and rusty chain was placed round his neck, he looked at it, smiled, and said to the executioners: "The Lord Jesus Christ, my Redeemer and Saviour, was bound with a harder and heavier chain, and I, wretch that I am, do not fear to be bound by and bear this for His Name's sake." Two faggots of wood were placed under his feet, and two cartloads of wood mixed with straw were piled around him, concealing his whole person up to the chin.

Before the fire was lighted, the marshal of the empire, Haupt of Pappenheim, came up, and invited him, in the presence of the Count Palatine, to save his life and soul by abjuration and recantation. Looking up to heaven, he replied in a loud voice: "God is my witness, that I have never taught or preached the things which are falsely ascribed to me, and which have been laid to my charge by false witnesses; but the principal intention of my preaching and of all my other actions and writings has simply been to draw men back from

sin; and in that truth of the Gospel, which I have written, taught, and preached according to the sayings and statements of the holy doctors, I am willing joyfully this day to die." The marshal and Count Palatine then struck their hands together and retired.

The pile was now lighted, but the terrible death endured not long. Twice did Hus chant with a loud voice: "O Christ, Son of the living God! have mercy upon me!" But when he endeavoured to continue: "Who wast born of the Virgin Mary," a gust of wind drove the flame into his face and stopped his voice. Then, apparently praying within himself, moving his lips and head, he expired in the Lord, within the time, as Mladenovitz narrates, during which two or three paternosters might be rapidly recited.

When the Count Palatine saw Hus's clothes in the hands of the executioners, he ordered them to be thrown into the still burning pile, promising the men compensation for the loss of their perquisites.* All his remains were carefully searched for, reduced to ashes, and cast into the neighbouring Rhine, that nothing might remain which his Bohemian friends could keep and carry home, and there honour and venerate as the holy relics of a martyr.

Such was the end of a spotless life, spent in the

* Two coats of good cloth, a girdle with a silver-gilt clasp, two side-knives in a sheath, and a leather pouch, "in which there might well be money," according to Reichenthal.

service of God, and animated by a zeal, the honesty of which none could deny, and with regard to which the utmost that the most bitter enemy could allege was, that it was not always sufficiently tempered with discretion. The supremacy of conscience in the soul, that of the scriptures in the Church, and the necessity for a reform of life and manners among the clergy, were the great ends to which John Hus devoted his life, and being dead, still speaketh to us from the place of his martyrdom at Constance. Well might the Bohemians be angered at the cruel murder of such a man, and well might they ere long exchange defiance with the wicked council. But it was not until cruel persecution arose in their own land, that the flame actually blazed forth, that crusade after crusade were driven back with shame and slaughter, that about two-thirds of Bohemia successfully withstood the whole might of papacy and empire, and finally, passing over to the offensive, triumphantly extorted that freedom of conscience, which is now the glory of the most civilized nations and countries of the world. It is true that that freedom was narrowed and diminished by force of circumstances, and that persecution for religion again appeared on the scene, even in free and constitutional Bohemia. It reappeared and vanished again, to break out with redoubled fury at the disastrous epoch of the "Thirty Years War," when the religious and political liberties of the nation were simultaneously destroyed, and Bohemia was brought back to the

obedience of Rome by the simple reduction of its inhabitants from four millions to less than eight hundred thousand.

But the thing that hath been may be again ; and the spectacle presented by the three diverse religious bodies of Calixtines, Taborites, and Orphans standing shoulder to shoulder in firm confederation against Rome, their common foe, exhibited a model to be imitated in future ages and in other nationalities. Hus did not die in vain ; his arguments against religious persecution remain on record unanswered and unanswerable for ever ; and the more civilized and the more highly regarded a nation is in the polity of the world, the more fully will it be found to have accepted his two grand principles of the supremacy of the conscience in the individual life and soul, and of the scriptures in the common life of the Church and in matters of faith. Hus was himself no sectarian, and cannot even be termed a Wycliffite. He rose above all distinctions of sect or party, and though he felt that he must himself perish, as perish he did, in the contest against the evil and corruption of his day, yet he also felt that others would rise up after him and carry on to completion the work which "the poor Goose," as he styled himself, had so nobly and dauntlessly begun. Morality, conscience, scripture, formed the threefold motto of his life and work ; and well will it be for us, if we have as keen and clear perception and appreciation of these three grand regulative powers as he had.

Add to this the unselfishness which is a remarkable and unfailing feature in his energetic life, and when we make allowance for the human frailty which exhibits itself in a tendency to over-subtilization, in an apparent over-reliance on his own powers of disputation, and in overflowings of righteous indignation insufficiently tempered by discretion, we have before us one of the finest and purest characters that ever came to the front against evil and on the side of good, one of the best of those good men and true, who from time to time stemmed the torrent of iniquity, apparently in vain, and seemed to be overwhelmed and swept away by it, but who in reality won victory by condemnation and death, whose work lived after them and lives on still, a perpetual heritage and possession for ever to the human race.

CHAPTER XI.

JOHN HUS AS A SCHOOL DIVINE.

THE writings of John Hus are essentially those of a transition epoch. The form of his Latin writings is purely scholastic, while anticipations of modern thought and modern modes of dealing with principles from time to time exhibit themselves among them. The scientific phraseology of his day envelopes almost everything with a kind of artificial husk, while in his Bohemian writings we see the man as he walked and talked amongst his fellows, not, as it were, disguised in plate or chain armour for the intellectual or theological tournament. Still, some of his Latin works, especially his greatest work, the treatise "On the Church," "*De Ecclesiâ*," are products of deep thought and great dialectic skill, and this one especially has a vast historical value, as the first symbolical book that heralded that insurrection against the mere authority of the papal See, which caused the more or less complete severance from Rome, first of the Bohemian

Church, and secondly of the various Churches of the Reformation. Let me state as briefly as possible the chief theoretical principles contained in and underlying the twenty-three chapters of this great Latin work, neglecting the form and attending solely to the matter and language of the writer.

“The Holy, Universal, or Catholic Church is the society or collective body (*universitas*) of all those who are predestined to salvation, whether they be present, past, or to come. It is therefore one and one only from the beginning to the end of the world. It is Christ’s immaculate spouse, whom we name as the chief and highest created thing in the creed immediately after the most holy uncreated Trinity. The heavenly angels also are a part or members of it. It is divided into three, the Church triumphant, the Church militant, and the Church dormant, which are united together by the bond of love, and have an uninterrupted reciprocal action upon each other.

“Christ is the head of the Catholic Church, and the Church is His mystical body, *i.e.* governed by the power and operation of Christ its head, and united and compacted by the bond of predestination. Every predestined person is a member of this mystical body, to which members Christ gives motion and sensation. As in the human body, so also of course in the Church, some members are more and others less noble; but, as the members of the body serve the soul, so do the members of the Church serve Christ without any jealousy or endeavour to exalt themselves above each other. And as there are in the body accidental portions, which are in the body, but are not parts of the body, which are therefore ejected again, so are there in the Church persons foreknown to eternal perdition, who are suffered in it for a time, but are not members of the Church, although they designate themselves Christians. For no position, no election by men, nor dignity constitutes any one a member of the Catholic Church, but only God’s predestination. And thus without special revelation no one can know whether he is

actually a member of the Church, neither can any one know this with respect to another, but it is in hope only, that all Christians are members of the Church of Christ.

“*A fortiori* there cannot be more heads of the Catholic Church than Christ, who is very man, and who in His manhood is exalted above all saints, and all celestial choirs. As Man Christ is Head of the Church within it (*caput intrinsecum*), as God, He is its Head without it (*caput extrinsecum*), so that in this manner He is true Mediator between the Church and the Divine Trinity. Besides Him no other Head of the Catholic Church is conceivable, but only a terrestrial chief (*capitaneus*) or representative of Christ (*vicarius*) over the Church militant, which is not the Catholic Church save only in a partial sense; and thus the Church militant, the Church in this partial sense, has, in a certain sense, three rulers—its earthly chief, Christ as man, and Christ as God, the first being subordinate to the second, the second to the third.

“The Holy Catholic Church is also called the Apostolic or Roman Church; whence it does not follow, that every pope, who is truly such, and the college of Roman cardinals, constitute the entire Catholic Church. For the Holy Apostolic Church is that which has never departed from the true faith of Christ and the Apostles, and which cannot err therein; but that popes have erred is proved by ecclesiastical history. But the Roman Church, *i.e.* the Church which has its seat at Rome, was from the beginning a partial Church, the society of all Christians living under the obedience of the Bishop of Rome, as the Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch were the societies of Christians living under the Bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch. In the first instance the Church flourished at Jerusalem, then to a greater extent at Antioch; nevertheless, the Catholic Church took its name from Rome for three reasons: (1) Because Christ knew that, instead of the unbelieving Jews, pagan nations, living under the dominion of Rome, would be instructed in His holy faith; (2) because a larger number of martyrs triumphed in that city than in any other in the world; (3) likewise, that it might be known that neither locality nor antiquity, but steadfast faith

is the foundation of the Church of Christ. And thus the Roman Church and the Catholic Church are one only in name, and Christ always remains the one Head of the Church, the only true Pope. According to the nature of the Catholic Church the Pope or Bishop of Rome is not and cannot be its head; it is possible that he may not be even a member of it; but he is the vicar or representative of Peter in the government of the Church militant, if he follows the morals of Peter; if not, he is rather the representative of Judas.

“For salvation, and therefore for a given person to be a member of the Church of Christ, faith is indispensably necessary, for the existence whereof two things are requisite; (1) the truth, which enlightens the reason, and (2) authority, which strengthens the spirit. He who is to be saved must be a believer; a believer is one who wavers not in faith that has been instilled by God, but holds firmly to the truth as given by God, and is ready to give his life for it; and in this way every one is bound to believe all the truth, which the Holy Spirit has placed in holy scripture. This is the highest authority in the faith; not so the statements of holy doctors or the pope’s bulls, whereto it is proper to give credence only so far as they state something out of holy scripture, or that is founded on scripture; the Pope of Rome with his curia is fallible.

The case is similar with the power assigned to the vicars of Christ upon earth, or with the keys of the Church. In the first place, this power is not material or secular, but spiritual, and therefore the keys of the Church are in the first place the knowledge of the teaching of holy scripture and the science of distinguishing; secondly, a judicial power, whereby the spiritual judge ought to receive the worthy into, and expel the unworthy out of, the kingdom, *i.e.* the Church. In its proper sense, this power over the Church can only be possessed by the Holy Trinity, as predestining to salvation, and therefore internally only by Christ, who is God and Man; but the authorities of the Church have this power instrumentally or ministerially. No one loses grace except by sin; and to obtain grace repentance is necessary, whereunto God softens the heart, and confession, after which of

His infinite mercy God releases from eternal perdition, which release the priest announces; and finally, giving of satisfaction and purification, which the priest imposes. Every priest, therefore, or ecclesiastical authority, has the power of binding and loosing, but nothing can be bound or loosed on earth which would not be previously bound or loosed in heaven. On reasonable grounds some things are committed to all authorities alike, some are reserved to superior authorities only."

Such are the main theoretical outlines of this remarkable work, a good deal of which is, however, devoted to polemical controversy on the questions of the day, and to the refutation of the positions of Hus's opponents. Quotations are so ingeniously dovetailed into the argument, that it is often difficult to distinguish them from the words of the author, who is careful to say as little as he possibly can from himself, while he works as much as he possibly can behind the shield of some standard authority generally accepted or regarded at the day. I take my first extract from the conclusion of the fourth chapter. It contains a distinction, on which Hus himself lays special stress:—

"It is hence manifest that there are two kinds of separation from the Church. The first is irremovable (*indeperdibilis*), even as all the 'foreknown' are separated from the Church. The second is removable (*deperdibilis*), as some heretics are by removable sin separated from the Holy Church, yet may by God's grace come to the fold of the Lord Jesus Christ. Of such He saith himself in the tenth of John: 'Other sheep have I, which are not of this fold, and them I must bring.' Other sheep He had according to predestination, which were not of this fold and of His Church according to present righteousness, but which He brought to life by His grace. And this distinction

between predestination and present grace is much to be noticed. For some are sheep according to predestination, and ravening wolves according to present unrighteousness, as Augustine, commenting on John, deduces. Similarly, some are sons according to predestination, but not yet according to present grace."

In chapter xv., after saying how certain it was that the clergy of the Church "halted into two parts" (*claudicat in duas partes*), i.e. the clergy of Christ and the clergy of antichrist, wherefore the laity, who were dependent upon them for support, could not possibly help tottering, when the clergy were so different in opinion and life, Hus proceeds:—

"These two parts may best be distinguished in this way, that the clergy of antichrist exerts itself more energetically for the defence of human traditions and privileges, which protect the pride or lucre of the world, and desires to live vaingloriously, voluptuously, and unlike Christ, putting the imitation of the Lord Jesus Christ in morals into the background; but the clergy of Christ labours diligently for Christ's laws and His privileges, whereby spiritual good is acquired for manifestation, eschews pride and the pleasure of the world, and seeks to live conformably to Christ, attending most carefully to the following of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can a faithful believer disbelieve that the latter part is true and the former in error. And although a man on his pilgrimage cannot without a revelation recognize for certain a true and holy shepherd, yet from his works, which are conformable to Christ's law, he ought to suppose that he is such."

In chapter xvi. Hus argues against the punishment of death for heresy:—

"As to what I conceive to be the principal intention of the doctors, whereby they mean that the pope ought to be judge of

all causes, and he who obeys him not ought to die the death of the body, the doctors ought to be ashamed of their apish and cruel parity of reasoning, especially as Christ Jesus our Lord would neither judge as a civil judge, nor condemn a disobedient person to the death of the body. For as to the first, He said in Luke xii. : 'O man, why makest thou Me a judge or divider over you?' And as to the second, He said to the woman taken in adultery, who the Pharisees said was liable to death according to the law (John viii.): 'Neither shall I condemn thee, go and sin no more.' But, because it might be said by the doctors, This is not to the point, because the law saith, 'He who is proud and refuseth to obey the command of the priest,' I will give a case exactly in point. In Matt. xviii. Christ saith: 'If thy brother sin against thee, go and reprove him between thee and him alone; if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. But if he hear them not, tell it to the Church; but if he hear not the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican.' To whom was it but to Peter, the future Roman pontiff after Himself, that the supreme Lord of law and Pontiff said, that he should piously reprove by himself an erring person, should convict before witnesses a disobedient one, should publish one persisting in disobedience to the Church, that is, to the multitude; and should not put to death corporally, but avoid as a publican and heathen, one obstinate and not obeying the Church? What pretence, then, is there for arguing by parity of reasoning (*a simili*): Under the old law a disobedient person ought to be put to death, therefore he ought to be so also under the law of grace? Hence Christ's disciples were deceived by that subtlety of arguing from parity of reasoning. For when, like the prophet Elias, they wanted to destroy the Samaritans, who would not receive Christ, with fire from heaven, saying, 'Lord, wilt Thou that we bid fire come down from heaven and destroy them?' the most pious of Pontiffs and best of Magisters reproved them. For next comes: 'And He turned and rebuked them, saying, Know ye not of what spirit ye are? For the Son of Man came not to destroy lives, but to save them,' Luke ix."

It is interesting in the same chapter to find Hus quoting Juvenal, and thus showing an acquaintance, not only with Aristotle and the philosophical writers commonly studied by theologians, but also with a wider range of classical authors. Quoting Isaiah ix., "The prophet speaking falsehood, he is the tail," Hus asserts that ;—

"The tail and the prophet speaking falsehood is the learned clergy, teaching that the pope is neither a god nor a man, but a mingled god or an earthly god; teaching that the pope can give me the property of another, and I shall be safe; that the pope can depose a bishop without cause; that he can grant dispensation against an apostle, against an oath, against a vow, against the law of nature, and that no one has a right to say to him, Why doest thou this? because he can lawfully say: '*Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*' ('Thus I will, thus I command, let my will be in the stead of a reason'), and thus is impeccable; and that he cannot commit simony, because all things are his, and therefore he can do as he pleases with them, since he can even command angels and save men or damn whom he will."

I will finish my extracts from the "De Ecclesiâ" with a passage in which Hus argues very forcibly against "Interdicts" in general ;—

"Hence I always want to know the foundation or reason of a general interdict, whereby the righteous are without fault deprived of the sacraments, as communion, confession, and the rest, and sometimes little children of baptism. Likewise, why God's ministry is diminished among righteous men by an interdict imposed on account of a single person. It would be very marvellous if an earthly king were deprived of service on the part of all his good servants on account of one servant of his who was adverse to him. And altogether so, if on account of one who was a good and faithful servant of the king, a vassal,

wishing to bend that servant to his will, forbad all the king's servants to perform their duties to the king himself. How is it, then, that a pope or bishop so inconsiderately, without scripture or a revelation, quite lightly forbids the exercise of the ministry of Christ the King? For when a general interdict is imposed on a city or diocese, sin is not diminished but increased."

Passages from this work and from Hus's replies to Stephen Palecz and Stanislas of Znaym were brought against him at his trial, but the above will be sufficient to exhibit the general style of his Latin writings. Palecz's pamphlet, which has not come down to us, appears to have rung the changes pretty vigorously upon the words, "*Quidam* autem de clero in regno Bohemiæ," which are several times repeated in the "counsel" of the Faculty of Theology, dated February 6th, 1413, and hence to have nicknamed Hus and his party "*Quidamistæ*." Hus retorts by terming Palecz, "*Fictor Quidamista*," "the Quidamist concoctor," from having concocted this nickname. Palecz rejoins by calling Hus's answer "*Quidæmon*," i.e. "*Quidam dæmon*;" for it must have been, he considered, an evil, not a good, spirit that inspired Hus to write it. The controversy is lively enough, but, with the exception of a limitation specially quoted and several times referred to during Hus's trial, does not add much to the matter of the greater work "*De Ecclesiâ*," which is really a symbolical book, both as regards Hus himself and the subsequent Bohemian Church. Palecz's change of mind after declaring that Pope John's bull on Indulgences and the

crusade contained many "palpable errors," "*errores manu palpabiles*," gives Hus abundant opportunity of taunting him with inconsistency, servility, and cowardice.

I give one extract from the reply to Palecz, and shall then leave the further consideration of Hus as a school divine, a light in which we have already seen a good deal of him during his trial at Constance:—

"Let then the Concoctor know that the ascension of Christ did not decapitate the Church militant and sever it from Christ its Head, but that by the ascension the Church militant is in its Head wondrously exalted above all angels, above every power and virtue and dominion. Let the Concoctor also know that the grace of predestination is the bond, whereby the body of the Church and every member thereof is joined to Christ the Head, —indissolubly joined, as the apostle saith in Rom. viii.: 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? tribulation, or straits, or persecution?' And below: 'Nor can any other creature separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus.' Here there is no doubt that the apostle, a member of the Church, speaks for all members of the Church who are united with Christ the Head by the love of God, which is the grace of predestination. Nay, the Head Himself saith in John x.: 'My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me, and I give them eternal life, and no one shall snatch them out of My hand.' Let, then, the Concoctor understand that the union of the Church, the body, and Christ, the head, is not a corporeal one, but the spiritual grace of predestination, and lastly the grace of present righteousness, by which Christ Himself dwells in the Church and its members, guiding it with its members towards obtaining a life of glory. And I should like the Quidamist Concoctor to tell me who is the head of the Church dormant? For if, by His ascension, Christ ceased to be the Head of the Church militant, it appears

with equal or greater manifestness that He ceased to be the Head of the Church dormant. But I know that He will not be able to assign any other Head save the Lord Jesus Christ. But when the Concoctor saith further that Christ gave Peter and his successors to the Church militant to keep a corporeal head upon the earth till the end of the world, I should be glad to hear from him how Peter was the corporeal head of the Church, when Peter himself was not united to the Church by any corporeal bond. For the power of Christ, whereby Peter ruled the Church, was not corporeal, but spiritual. Similarly the grace of predestination, or even grace that does what is pleasing according to present righteousness, whereby Peter, as a member of the Church, was united to the Church, was not corporeal. How, then, was Peter, or any other successor of his, the corporeal head of the Church militant? The Concoctor must invent some mode, which, as I think, he will not make good."

How difficult it seems to have been for Hus, as a school divine and writing in Latin, to keep for any length of time aloof from his theory of predestination! Yet how small a part does it play in his Bohemian writings! Over-subtlety and over-refinement exhibit themselves also to a far greater extent in Hus's Latin than in his Bohemian works. And in reading the former, no one can help observing the justice and good sense of Lord Henry Lacembok's advice to him, as recorded by himself in one of his Latin letters: "*Dobry muzi, nehlúpaj!*" "Good man, don't subtilize!" (Letter 50 in the *Documenta*.)

CHAPTER XII.

JOHN HUS AS A WRITER IN HIS NATIVE LANGUAGE.

THE collected Latin writings of John Hus have been long before the world, although the collection is by no means perfect, but errs both on the side of excess and on that of defect. But his writings in his native Bohemian tongue were collected and many of them printed for the first time in three volumes, edited by the late K. J. Erben, Archivarius of the Old Town of Prague, and published in the years 1865, 1866, and 1868. We can now know this extraordinary man, not only as a school divine and as a controversionalist among theologians, but as a living and moving power in his own country, addressing his brethren and speaking to their hearts in their own native tongue.

The first work that meets the eye in the first volume consists of longer and shorter expositions of the creed, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer. Hus introduces the treatise and gives his reasons for writing it in the following words :--

"Every Christian who possesses understanding, if he wishes to be saved, must fulfil God's law and pray to God. With

respect to the first, the Saviour said : 'He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.' With respect to the second he says : 'If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments.' With respect to the third he saith : 'Men ought to pray.' Since these things are thus necessary to a man for eternal life, it is good that he should become acquainted with them ; that, being acquainted with them, he should understand them, and that, understanding them, he should fulfil them in practice. And since without faith it is impossible to please God, St. Paul saith : 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation ;' and a man cannot believe God and in God unless he hearkens to Him, and how shall he hearken to Him unless some one instruct him ?

"Because I am a priest sent by God, in the hope that I should teach the people to believe, to fulfil the commandments of God, and to pray to God aright, I wish briefly to expound these three things to simple people. And since to a person desiring to draw near to God, the first thing necessary is faith, as a first foundation in God ; the second, keeping of the commandments ; and the third, suitable prayer ; therefore I desire, first, to make known the Great King to His courtier in the creed ; secondly, His commandments ; and then prayer, that, knowing his Lord and keeping His commandments, he may, with propriety, venture to beseech his God, and He be pleased to hearken to him. Therefore, thou that desirest to serve in the court of the greatest of Kings, oughtest thus to know Him with the heart, that is, to believe, and with the mouth, if it be necessary, to confess Him before men unto death."

Then follows the Apostles' Creed, commented upon article by article. The following is a striking passage on the "foundation of faith" (*zalozenie viery*), chapter v. :—

"Likewise also ought all Christians to believe what God hath commanded to be believed ; even though every man may not

know all that ought to be believed, yet he is ready and ought to be ready, when the truth is shown him out of the holy scriptures, to receive it gladly, and should he hold anything contrary to the scripture, to forsake it immediately. And it is good for every man not to hold anything rashly; but, when he comes to know God's truth, to hold it firmly even unto death, for the truth will eventually make him free; for the Lord Jesus saith: 'If ye continue in My word, then will ye be My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' Therefore, faithful Christian! seek the truth, hearken to the truth, learn the truth, hold the truth, defend the truth, even unto death; for the truth will make thee free from sin, from the devil, from the death of the soul, and finally from everlasting death, which is everlasting separation from the favour of God, and from all the bliss of salvation, which bliss he will obtain who believeth in God and in Jesus Christ, who is Very God and Very Man."

Hus gives his sentiments on the power of the priesthood in causing the real presence in the Eucharist in chapter ix. :—

"From these testimonies thou hast that the priests talk foolishly and erroneously, when they say: 'We can, when we will, create God or the body of God.' As if they were creators of their Creator, and that when, all together, they cannot create a single fly! And thus speaking they howl like wolves, desiring to exalt themselves above the laity and extend the sphere of their covetousness. And in token thereof they preach with respect to the new masses, that the priest is more worthy than the Mother of God, and that he creates the body of God, and they prove it thus: 'The Mother of God bore Him once, but the priest creates Him often and when he pleases; and thus by one error they prove another. But the humble priest does not exalt himself above the Virgin Mary, or say that he is the creator of Christ, the Son of God, but that the Lord Christ by His power and word, through him, causes that which

is bread to be His body ; not that at that time it began to be His, but that there on the altar begins to be sacramentally, in the form of the bread, what previously was not there and therein."

The first mention of Wycliffe occurs in chapter xx., in considering the question of the power of the keys. After narrating the raising of Lazarus, Hus proceeds :—

" In this fact thou hast, that God the Father and Christ and Christ's call restored Lazarus to life, and the disciples looked on in readiness, and then, at the word of command, loosed him when living. So it is in the remission of mortal sins, when a dead soul is to revive. God Himself cleanseth it by His power from internal stain, remits its sin, and unbinds it through Christ's merits from the debt of everlasting death ; but the priest cannot do this, *i.e.* cannot thus cleanse and revive the soul, but he has power to loose and to bind, that is, to declare people bound and loosed. Therefore Christ first revived Lazarus, and they afterwards loosed him, that he might see and walk freely ; and also He first healed the lepers Himself, and afterwards sent them to the priest, that they (the priests) might give testimony to Christ, that He had healed them (the lepers), and might also declare to them that they could with safety dwell publicly in the congregation. And thus thou hast, that it is impossible for the priest to remit the sins of any one unless they are first remitted by God and by Christ, the Grand Priest, and His merits. Therefore saith the MAGISTER OF DEEP THOUGHTS, that God does not follow the judgment of the priest, who often judges treacherously and ignorantly, but God always judges according to truth."

There is a heaviness about the " Exposition of the Ten Commandments," from which the " Exposition of the Creed " is entirely free, and which does not appear so decidedly in the " Exposition of the

Lord's Prayer." Still there are many remarkable passages in it, of which the following is a specimen from chapter xxxv. After quoting a passage from the third decretal of Innocent III., Hus proceeds :—

"This is the great constitution of Innocent III., but, because it is somewhat adverse to the purse or pocket of the priest, it is not liked; but, were it observed, they would perhaps exhibit fewer teeth of St. Barbara and other things called relics by them. And believe me, it is thus that the priests publicly incite people to offer who are in the habit of giving them less than formerly. And already even the peasants have a proverbial expression, 'That priest is a capital hand at bringing in the silver conclusion,' when they hear him saying that people are to approach the relic, and commend themselves to it and open their hearts, that is, their purses. Nay, I once heard in a sermon—God is my witness that it was said in a sermon at St. Henry's in the New Town of Prague—'Know, my children, that three devils have come to this festival; one to close the heart, that people may not be sorry for their sins, and, children, that is a wicked devil; a second to close their mouths, that they may not pray and praise God, and, children, that is a worse; and a third to close their purses—ah! children, that is the worst! Therefore, dear children, do not allow this worst devil to close your purses; approach the relic, opening your purses and pockets.'"

In chapter xxxix., after speaking of the five senses as the windows through which sin enters, Hus proceeds in language which exhibits towards the end of the passage what we may almost venture to call the *ne plus ultra* of homely illustration :—

"These windows or doors ought to be closed in Jerusalem, that is, in a man who desires the vision of the divine peace, and especially on a Sunday or holy day, lest the doors should be

opened to vanity, for Jeremiah saith : ‘ Take heed to yourselves and bear no burthens on the Sabbath day, neither bring in any burthen through the gates of Jerusalem.’ Here he forbids the burthen of sin, which is called the talent or hundredweight of lead, as saith holy Zachariah the prophet ; for sin immediately by its weight drew Lucifer from the highest place down to the lowest hell. And therefore sin is termed *grievous* or *heavy*, for, as a heavy thing always drops downwards, as far as possible, as a stone, lead, or any other heavy thing, so likewise does sin drag the soul downwards, but it does not feel the weight unless it quits the body. For as a dog in a boat with a large stone tied to his neck does not feel the weight unless he is thrown out of the boat and drowned, so likewise the soul does not feel the weight so long as it is in the body, but when once it quits the body, then it begins to feel it, when it falls into the depth of hell.”

In chapter xli., Hus explains his views on the subject of *election*. Strange to say, no word corresponding to *predestination* occurs in his Bohemian words, the word “*predvedeny*,” “*foreknown*,” (*præscitus*) being the nearest approach to it. The passage runs :—

“ Whoso doth actions that the devil commands, and loveth not Christ and heareth not His word gladly, the same hath the devil for his father, not by creation, but by wickedness ; and he hath not Christ for a father in grace here below at that time, although another, who is also wicked, is God’s son, elected from eternity. As St. Peter, when he swore falsely that he knew not Christ, was at that time without grace ; yet nevertheless he was a son of God by eternal election, although he was at that time a son of the devil through mortal sin. In the same way many are now sinful sons of the devil and also sons of God ; sons of the devil through sin for a time, but sons of God by election from eternity ; and when they repent, like

Peter, they cast off devilry from themselves and become sons of God only, as in process of time did St. Peter. But those who are in mortal sins and remain in them, these are sons of the devil through wickedness, and sons of God by creation, by preservation, and by nourishment, but not by grace unto salvation."

In chapter lxii. occurs a remarkable and characteristic passage on slander or backbiting:—

"Alas! how greatly have backbiting dogs increased in number, and backbiting has already become such a habit that it is not considered a sin. For priests, when just about to robe themselves in the mass vestments for the mass, practise backbiting. God is my witness, that I have heard it myself! And after mass, when they meet at table, they devour living before they eat cooked flesh. And what is a more grievous slander than to call a neighbour a heretic? And thus they serve the devil more than the Lord God, as St. Augustine saith, on account of their backbiting. Likewise lay people, monks and nuns, practise backbiting a little less, or perhaps still more, settle the whole world, the quick and the dead, but forget themselves. Oh! if they remembered what they repeat in the hours, how the holy David saith: 'With him that slandereth his neighbour, with him I have not eaten!' Oh! with whom could a true man eat now, if he refused to eat with a backbiter, when backbiting is everywhere a dish at table, especially at a priest's table? At which they sit still and eat, putting one piece into the mouth and letting out ten calumnious words. And they devour their neighbour with less compassion than the cooked meat, for they do not gnash their teeth at the meat as they do at their neighbour. Therefore saith the righteous man through David: 'They gnashed upon me with their teeth.'"

Proceeding to the "Exposition of the Lord's Prayer," it is not long before we meet (chapter

lxxxi.) with a passage on prayer, the language of which is singularly homely and forcible :—

“Prayer has the fire of love, which raises it mightily towards God, and two wings, that is to say, recognition of our own wickedness and of God’s mercy. These two good wings bear prayer up to God along with love; for, if there be not love, prayer does not ascend to God, and if there be not holy thoughts which clarify prayer, and devotion besides, then prayer smokes fetidly. Therefore, dear brother, if thou hast not love and holy thoughts and devotion, stink not and smoke not. O dear God! how often do I, sinful man that I am, stink and smoke against Thy holy love!”

In chapter lxxxvii. we have a most exquisite and eloquent piece of exegesis, which may well stand in contrast with the rugged language just quoted :

“But since we know that God accepts not persons, therefore we say not apart from others: ‘*My Father!*’ but humbly and socially: ‘*Our Father?*’ For as dignity in the world neither severs nor excepts any one from misery or death, so likewise neither does it sever or except from equal participation in the grace of God; but in proportion as that dignity gives occasion of pride to the elevated, so doth it immediately render them more unworthy and rejected before the eyes of the most righteous Judge. And hence I infer that proud, great men in the world are still more rejected before God on account of their non-humble prayer; for since the Almighty Saviour is not ashamed to call us wretches brethren, as St. Paul saith, and since He saith: ‘Whoso shall do the will of My heavenly Father, the same is My mother, and sister, and brother,’ how is it that inflated wretches are ashamed to be called the brethren of all Christians? What is this but that they wish to be above Christ, although they say it not with their lips? But not thus speak humble sons, who say lovingly and humbly, remembering their Father’s instruction: ‘Our Father, who art in heaven! Our Father, powerful in might, who art our Creator! Our

Father, sweet in loving! Our Father, rich in inheritance! Our Father, merciful in redemption! Our Father, able to protect! Our Father, always ready to listen!’ See what manner of Father is ours, who is in heaven!”

We now come to a very finished work, one that would bear translation as a whole, and which is interesting from its noble morality, loftiness of tone and bearing upon matters discussed in our own country in our own day. It is intituled, “*O Scatokupectví*,” “Of Traffic in Holy Things,” *i.e.* “Of Simony.”

After proving simony to be a kind of heresy, Hus proceeds to divide heresy into three stems—apostacy, blasphemy, and simony—each of which he explains by instances. He then divides those guilty of simony into the followers of Simon, Gehazi, Balaam, Jeroboam, and Judas, each of which classes he examines separately. Then in chapter iv. he raises the question whether the pope can be guilty of simony, proves that he can be so in three several ways, and disproves the various excuses commonly brought forward in his defence. In chapter v. he inquires how bishops can fall into simony, and examines the excuses alleged in their defence. From this chapter I extract a criticism on the position of titular bishops, whose dioceses are *in partibus infidelium*, and who thus are bishops in little more than name, and whose conduct was not always what it ought to be:—

“Likewise WILD BISHOPS excuse themselves by saying that they should not have the means of life and existence if they

did not take money for consecrations. But the first answer is: Since such a one is the representative or assistant of a bishop, let the bishop give him what he requires, for he maintains other gentlemen, and many of them, who do not appertain to the episcopal office. The second answer is: Let the wild bishop live in poverty, like Peter and Paul the apostles, and preach the word of God. And the third answer is: Let him go and preach to the people from which he has the title of bishop. But, alas! they have the title and do not, as they ought, do good among the people, over which they have been created bishops. Therefore the Bohemian who gave them the name 'wild bishops' (*planí biskupové*), did it, perhaps, because they do little good amongst people, especially the people of their own bishopric. And the fourth answer is: Let people ask him why he got himself consecrated, knowing that he had no intention of going to the people in question, and likewise being ignorant of their language. And, perhaps, if he confessed the truth, he would admit that he obtained the episcopal rank for worldly dignity and for freedom's sake. And it is for this latter reason that monks are wont to become these 'wild' bishops and patriarchs, as is manifest; for then they escape from obedience to the authorities of their order."

The sixth and seventh chapters examine the simoniacal practices of the regular and secular clergy respectively, and some of the latter are described in the following extract:—

"They likewise sell holy oil dearer than other oil, and that for no other reason than that it is holy; taking sometimes two groschen, sometimes twelve pfennigs, and sometimes a groschen. Then for thirty masses they generally take thirty groschen; and this is perhaps a memorial of Judas, who sold the Saviour for thirty silver pence. And some priests undertake so many masses, that if one served five, six, or ten every day, he could not complete them in fifteen years. But, say they, 'How am I to do when a person comes to me, wanting thirty masses, and

entreats me?’ And I reply that thou oughtest to say, ‘Dear brother! all the masses in the world are thine, if thou art in the grace of God. And I am ordained to serve the mass, whenever I can by the grace of God, so that I ought not to serve any more for money than I ought to serve from love; therefore I cannot engage myself to thee, neither is it proper that I should do so. Go, and God be with thee!’”

In chapter viii. Hus examines the simony of laymen; in chapter ix. inquires into the guilt of those who aid and abet or assent to simony; and in chapter x. details the proper methods of avoiding and getting rid of simony. And here we find the real secret of the inveteracy with which he was pursued by the higher Roman clergy, viz. his arguments from the Old Testament for the supremacy of the temporal over the spiritual power, and the duty of the former to reform the abuses of the latter; and, finally, his proof of the principle from “the bull of St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 13), in which he commandeth all men to submit to the king as supreme.”

The conclusion of the work, which is dated Candlemas, 1413, is very fine:—

“And in proof that we ought thus to measure nearness to the Lord Christ, He saith: ‘Whoso doeth the will of My heavenly Father, the same is My brother, My mother, and sister.’ And again He saith: ‘Ye are My friends, if ye do those things which I command you.’ See how He measures nearness to Himself by the keeping of His commandments! . . . And so with regard to other truths, which are laid before our eyes that we may indeed press to them and follow our Saviour Jesus Christ; for we cannot have a better guide and teacher, nor any other foundation or a purer mirror. Therefore after Him let us

go, to Him let us listen, and on Him let us place faith, hope, love, and all good works ; on Him, as into a mirror, let us gaze, and to Him let us approach with all our might ! And let us hear, in that He saith, ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life’—the way in example, the truth in promise, and the life in recompense. The way in example, wherein if a man goes he erreth not ; the truth in promise, for what He hath promised that He will fulfil ; and the life in recompense, for He will give Himself to be enjoyed in everlasting bliss. He is also the way, because He leads to salvation ; He is the truth, because He shines in the understanding of the faithful ; and He is the life everlasting, in which all the elect will live in bliss for ever. To that life and by that way and truth I desire to go myself and to draw others.”

The second volume contains Hus’s “Postilla,” or sermons on the Gospels for every Sunday and important holy day in the calendar. It might have been expected that this would have been the most interesting and remarkable work of so great a preacher. But it is not so ; and though—over and above simple and energetic expositions of the Gospels—the Postilla abound in historical materials and in vivid allusions to matters of the day, yet we must seek for traces of Hus’s vigorous eloquence rather in his other works than in this. The reason of this is given by himself in his preface to the book, in which he states that his intention is, so far as he is able, to explain the Gospels in the manner easiest to be understood, and “*not in his usual manner of preaching.*”

The following is a curious anecdote from the sermon on the First Sunday in Lent, which is interesting from its relation to the Faulfisch,

whose surname has been erroneously transferred to Jerome of Prague :—

“I heard from Nicholas, surnamed Faulfisch, a faithful man of good memory, that, when he was in England, he made the acquaintance of a certain cook, with whom he boarded. When a bishop asked this man why he read the scriptures in English contrary to his prohibition, and the cook defended himself by citing scripture, the bishop said to him, ‘Knowest thou with whom thou art speaking?’ He replied, ‘With a bishop, who is a man.’ The bishop said to him, ‘Darest thou, miserable layman, talk with me out of the scripture?’ He answered, ‘I know that thou art not greater than Christ, and I hope I am not worse than the devil; and since the gracious Christ listened calmly to scripture from the devil, why shouldest not thou, who art inferior to Christ, hear it from me who am a man?’ The bishop became exasperated, and would not talk with him any more; so that the cook overcame the bishop with scripture, as Christ did the devil.”

A terrible description of the condition and conduct of a large portion of the clergy is given in the sermon for the Second Sunday after Easter, which may be compared with the admissions of Andrew of Brod, at the conclusion of the “Historical Introduction,” chapter i. It runs :—

“Antichrist has no mightier net than the putting a stop to the service of God, whereby the priests obtain their will, whatever it is. With this net they defend their covetousness and riches; with this net they have severed themselves from suffering either in property or in person; so that, whereas the primitive holy Christians, especially the priests, joyfully endured it when people took their goods from them, or reviled, beat, tortured, and slew them,—*they* never put a stop to divine service, but prayed the more, offered Christ and preached the more—the present backsliding priests, on the contrary, have so

fenced themselves with antichrist's institution, that if any one takes aught from a priest, even if justly, or if a priest is seized in the commission of adultery or robbery, a stop is immediately put to Divine service, if a priest, who is an adulterer or robber, be imprisoned. If, again, a box on the ear be given to a priest in a quarrel in a tavern, when there is a dispute about dice, or worse, citations and excommunications are issued. If, however, a priest's blood be drawn, they put a stop to Divine service, and compel the person who has done it to go to Rome, saying that none, save the pope, can absolve a man who draws a priest's blood. But if a priest cuts off anybody's foot or hand, or kills a man who is guiltless, they do not excommunicate the priest, or put a stop to Divine service. Why so? Because one devil does not pick out another devil's eyes."

I will take one more extract from the sermon on the Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity, and then proceed to the third volume:—

"In this and in a still greater sin are the present prelates, magisters, and lawyers, who value their cattle more than the spiritual health of their neighbours. Therefore saith St. Bernard to Pope Eugenius: 'An ass falls, and there is some one who lifts it up; a soul perishes, and there is no one to regard it.' St. Bernard knew that the pope's missionaries (*apostles*) were more attentive to asses and mules than to souls, which were floundering in the mire of sins. And, as they from avarice rescued the ass from the pit, and said that they did not break the sabbath; but that, when a sick man was restored to health, the sabbath was broken, so do those of the present day. What they do from avarice they do not set down as a sin; but what is done from compassion, that they put down as a sin. Lo! those Jews drew the ass out at once, when it fell into the pit, to prevent its death; and said to the sick man, 'It is not fitting to be healed on the sabbath.' And those of the present day say, that it is not fitting to preach the Word of God and draw sinners from sin without *their* absolution; and affirm that it is fitting for

them to sell benefices as they please, and that they ought to be obeyed in whatever they command. But eventually, they will be mute before Jesus, as they were mute of whom the scripture saith: 'And they could not answer to those things;' for they were overcome by the truth."

The third volume commences with a mystical exposition of the Song of Solomon, which is of no great interest. But next comes a charming little work: "*Of the knowledge of the true way of Salvation,*" commonly called "*The Daughter*" (*Dcerka*), from the commencement of every chapter, which runs: "Hear, O daughter! and see and incline thine ear!" The "daughter" is the human soul, and the work itself contains practical advice of the highest value. I select the following from the second of its ten chapters:—

"Hear, O daughter, and see and incline thine ear, because it is good that thou shouldest understand thy conscience. Know that thou canst not finally conceal sins, for thou must acknowledge them in the judgment day to all people, to the angels and to the devils. Hear, see, and incline thine ear, because, whithersoever thou turnest thyself, whatsoever thou placest in thy soul and in thy conscience, be it evil or good, thy conscience preserves for thee so long as thou livest, and will return it to thee when thou diest. For it is a warning voice placed in every soul, in order that it may keep its promise to God: if it doth evil, the conscience is immediately affected; if, on the other hand it doth good, and the soul is not proud thereof, a right conscience doth not inflict chastisement; but if a man doeth evil, conscience is with him while alive, and dogs him after death. And thus, whithersoever a man turneth himself, praise or blame always attends him; and thus in his own house, that is in his own soul, he has adversaries of his own household. Lo! his conscience accuses him, his memory testifies against

him, his understanding judges him, pleasure points out how he ought to be tortured, fear or terror is the executioner, and pleasures are the tortures; for in proportion to the evil pleasures that a man has had, so many and so great sufferings must he have, as saith the Scripture. 'Hear this, O daughter, and see and incline thine ear!'"

From a vivid controversial dialogue with the devil in chapter iv. I extract the following, which gives Hus's views on the subject of confession:—

"If thou sayest further: 'Cain and Saul are lost, as saith the Scripture,' this we admit; but if thou sayest: 'These men sinned less than I did,' this I deny; for they sinned with the sin of final impenitence, and that sin is greater than all other sins; for, though a man have all manner of other sins, if only he hath not this, he is not lost and will not be lost, if he hath it not. And this sin, O devil, is thy sin! Thirdly, then, O devil, if thou sayest to a man who is not conscious of mortal sin: 'In whatsoever thou doest, thou doest evil,' this, O devil, we deny; and if thou endeavourest to prove it, saying: 'For thou art in mortal sin,' O devil, thou liest! thou canst not prove it, and in what thou sayest afterwards, thou liest; for I repent, I have lamented my sin and confessed it, and always do confess it to the Lord God, acknowledging myself guilty to Him, in whatsoever manner I may have sinned. Neither, O devil, shalt thou lead me to this, always to confess anew in sorrow and relate all the causes and circumstances of my sins to a priest or mention all my particular sins; for I know that it is not necessary to enumerate them to the Lord God, who knows them all, and I acknowledge myself to Him guilty in them all, and lament them. This, thou, O devil, dost not do, and therefore thou sufferest everlasting perdition."

Then come various little pamphlets or treatises, from one of which, written against a priest who had become steward of the kitchen to a nobleman

named Ctibor, and who had said, and confirmed with an oath, that Hus was worse than any devil, I shall extract the following passage in which Hus plays upon his own name:—

“I might write about the curse with which thou reproachest me, but it would be tedious, and I have inscribed a notice of it on the walls in Bethlehem. Yet, I say briefly, that a curse hurts no man, if priests curse him when he is free from mortal sin and suffers it lovingly; for St. Peter saith in his epistle: ‘Who is he that shall harm you, if ye love that which is good.’ And St. Gregory speaks to that effect, and thou recitest in the hours, that no adversity will hurt, if no wickedness be dominant. And the Saviour himself saith: ‘Blessed shall ye be when all men shall curse you.’ And thus people by the gift of God now understand, that a curse pronounced against a man without mortal sin tends to blessing and life eternal, and that by means of that curse the priests first terrified and scared whom they would, even as fowlers scare birds with a kite, and these, fancying the wooden kite to be a living bird, do not dare to rise. But because THE GOOSE, a domestic bird, recognized this dead kite, he did not allow himself to be scared, but rose into the air and gave an example to God’s other birds to do the like.”

I offer no extract from the three hymns ascribed to Hus in the hymn book of the Bohemian brethren (Kralitz, 1576), which I do not believe to have proceeded from his pen in their present condition. But the little fragment “*On Faith*” contains a passage too remarkable to be omitted:—

“Hence further infer, that we ought not to believe *in* the Mother of God, but ought to believe that she is the most worthy Mother of God, more worthy than any saint. Although there is one Virgin, who is the bride of Christ, more worthy than the Virgin Mary, and that is the Holy Church, the congregation of

all saints, who will finally reign with Christ for ever. For the Virgin Mary is a member of the Holy Church, and cannot be of such worthiness; and it was for that Church, His bride, that Christ died and gave Himself up to death, as saith St. Paul, and not for the Virgin Mary. Thus we believe *of* the Virgin Mary, but not *in* her; for we ought not to believe *in* any other person or thing, save only in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, all in one Lord."

I now pass on to the letters, especially those in the Bohemian language, and select first that written on the road to Constance after September 28th, 1414, a pretended extract from which was brought against Hus at his trial:—

"Magister John Hus, in hope a priest and servant of our Lord Jesus Christ, to all faithful and beloved brethren and sisters in the Lord Jesus, who have through me heard and received the Word of God, grace and peace from God our Father and from the Holy Spirit, that they may abide without spot in his truth!

"Faithful and beloved friends! ye know that I have long worked with you faithfully, preaching to you the Word of God without heresy and without errors, as ye know, and my desire hath been, and will be until death, your salvation. I had thought to have preached to you before my journey, ere I departed to the council at Constance, and especially to have made known to you the false testimony and witnesses in writing with their evidence; and these shall be made known to you in order that, if they condemn me, or sentence me to death, ye, knowing this, may not be terrified, as if I were condemned for any heresy that I held; and, likewise, in order that ye may stand without fear and without vacillation in the truth, to the knowledge whereof the Lord God hath granted you to come through faithful preachers and through me unworthy; and, thirdly, that ye may be able to beware of hypocritical and lying preachers. And now I have prepared myself for the

journey WITHOUT SAFE CONDUCT* among very great and very numerous enemies, among whom my enemies from home are the worst, as ye recognize from the evidence, and will learn after the conclusion of the council; of whom there will be many bishops and magisters, secular priests and regulars. But I hope to my gracious, wise, and mighty Saviour, that through His promise and your faithful prayer He will grant me wisdom and steadfastness of the Holy Ghost, that I may persevere, and that they may not be able to make me take the wrong part; even if He gives me to suffer temptation, reviling, imprisonment, or death, as He suffered Himself, and subjected His best beloved servants to the same, and gave us an example that we should suffer for Him and for our own salvation; He being God, and we His creatures; He being the Lord, and we His servants; He being the King of the whole world, and we unworthy mannikins; He being without want, and we necessitous. He, too, has suffered, and why should not we suffer? Nay, our suffering in grace is our purification from sin and our liberation from everlasting torments, and death is our purification. Verily it is impossible for His faithful servant to perish, if with His help he abides steadfast! Therefore, dear brethren! dear sisters! pray earnestly, that He may be pleased to grant me perseverance, and that He may be pleased to protect me from stain; and, if my death is to His glory and our profit, that it may please Him to grant me to undergo it without evil terror; if, on the other hand, it is better for us that it should be so, that it may please Him to cause me to return to you, travelling thither and back again without stain, that we may still instruct each other in common in His law, and destroy

* *Bez kleitu*. In the Latin translation (op. Hus. i. 72-6) this stands: "Ego proficiscor nunc *cum* literis publicæ fidei a Rege mihi datis." Palacky remarks, that the sixteenth century translator of Hus's letters into Latin did his work exceedingly ill, and that his translation contains a great deal of nonsense, as well as, now and then, just the contrary of what Hus intended to express.

some portion of the nets of antichrist, and set a good example to future brethren after us. Perhaps ye will never see me more in Prague before my death! If, on the other hand, the mighty God shall be pleased to bring me back, we shall see each other with so much the greater pleasure, and that, at any rate, when we meet together in the bliss of heaven. May the merciful God, who gives secure peace to His own both here and after death, who perfected the grand Shepherd by the shedding of His blood, which is the everlasting evidence of our salvation, fashion you in all that is good, that ye may fulfil His will in concord without dissension, that, having rest in virtues, ye may attain everlasting rest, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who is eternal God and very Man, born of the Virgin Mary, to whom glory is and will be for ever with all the elect, with whom, if we persevere in the truth, we shall abide for ever. Amen. Dated, A.D. 1414, after the feast of St. Wenceslas, on the journey to Constance."

The following is a very striking letter, dated June 24th, 1415:—

"Magister John Hus, in hope a servant of God, declares to all the faithful, who love God and His law, his desire that they may abide in the truth, and make progress in the grace of God, and stand steadfastly unto death. Dearly beloved! I exhort you not to be terrified nor to allow yourselves to be scared, because they have condemned my books to the flames. Remember that they burned the holy Jeremiah's prophecy, which God commanded him to write; yet did they not escape from that which he prophesied; for after it was burnt, the Lord God commanded him to write the same words, adding thereto still more. As was done; he dictated, sitting in prison, and the holy Baruch, who was his scribe, wrote. This stands written in the thirty-sixth chapter. Likewise is it written in the books of the Maccabees, that the law of God was burnt, and those who possessed it tortured. Afterwards, in the time of the new law, the saints were burnt with the books of God's law. Likewise the cardinals condemned and burned the books of St.

Gregory, and wished to burn them all, but the Lord God prevented it by means of a scholar of his, Peter. Likewise two priestly councils condemned St. John Chrysostom as an heretic; yet the merciful Lord God showed their falsehood after St. John's death. Having these things before your eyes, do not allow yourselves to be frightened into not reading what I have written, or into giving them your books to be burned. Remember what our merciful Saviour said, as a warning, in Matthew xxiv: that before the judgment-day there would be so great tribulation, as had not been since the world began, neither would be afterwards, so great that, if it were possible, even the elect would be led into error; but those days would be shortened for the elect's sake. Remembering this, dearly beloved, stand firmly! for I hope to God the school of antichrist will fear you, and leave you in peace, and the council will not come from Constance into Bohemia; for I am sure many out of this council will die before they take the books from you by conquest; and from this council they will fly in all directions about the world, like storks, and when the winter comes, they will find out what they have done in the summer. Observe that they have condemned their own head as a heretic! Now answer, ye preachers, who preach that the pope is a terrestrial God, that he cannot sin, that he cannot commit simony, as say the jurists; that the pope is the head of all the Holy Church, which he governs admirably; that he is the heart of the Holy Church, which he animates spiritually; that he is the fountain, whence all power and goodness flow; that he is the sun of the Holy Church; that he is the all-sufficient refuge, to which every Christian must flee. Lo! now has that head been cut off, and the terrestrial god bound; now has he been proclaimed guilty of sin; now has the fountain been dried up, the sun obscured, the heart torn out; and the refuge has fled from Constance, and has now been cast away, so that no one flees to him. The council has condemned him as a heretic for selling remissions, and bishoprics, and other things, and revenues; and those have condemned him, many of whom have purchased from him, and others have purchased

elsewhere. There was John, Bishop of Litomysl, who trafficked twice for the archbishopric of Prague, but others outbid him. Oh, why did they not first cast the beam out of their own eye? Yet the law saith of them: 'If there be any one who hath obtained any dignity through money, let him be deprived of it!' Yes, let the seller and the buyer, and the bargainer or go-between, be put to open shame! Saint Peter reviled and cursed Simon for wishing to purchase the gift of the Holy Spirit: these men have reviled and cursed a seller, and have remained purchasers and go-betweens themselves, and also act as sellers at home! In Constance, there is a bishop who purchased, and another who sold, and the pope received money for his assent. Likewise is it in Bohemia, as is known to you. Oh, if the Lord Jesus had said to the council: 'Let him that is without the sin of simony among you condemn Pope John!' me seemeth they would have gone out one after the other. And why did they kneel before him, kiss his feet, and address him as 'most holy father!' knowing that he was a heretic, a murderer, and a * * *, even as they proved these sins against him? Why did the cardinals elect him pope, knowing that he was so wicked a murderer, that he slew the most holy father? Why did they permit him to practise simony when he became pope, they being appointed councillors in order to give good counsel? Are they not also guilty who practised simony with him themselves? Why, until he fled from Constance, did no one venture to say anything to him but 'most holy father?' No, they were still afraid; but when, by God's permission or will, the secular hand fell upon him, then they immediately conspired, making a covenant that he might not be released. Verily the wickedness, and abominableness, and shamefulness of antichrist have now displayed themselves in the case both of the pope and of others in the council; now may the faithful servants of God mark in our Saviour's discourse what He meant by saying: 'When ye shall see the abomination in a desolate place (*sic*), of which Daniel prophesied, let him that readeth understand'! The great abomination is pride, covetousness, and simony, in a desolate place, that is, in dignity, which is void of

humility, love, and the other virtues, as we see manifestly in those who are holding office and dignity. Oh, if it were possible to describe the wickednesses, that the faithful servants of God might beware of them, I would gladly do so; but I hope to God that He will send others more worthy after me, who will better expose the wickedness of antichrist, and will hazard their lives unto death for the sake of the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will give you and me everlasting bliss. Amen. Written on the festival of St. John the Baptist, in a dungeon and in fetters, in the recollection that John was likewise beheaded in a dungeon and in fetters for the sake of God's truth."

The next letter, dated June 26th, is equally worthy of perusal:—

"Magister John Hus, in hope a servant of God, makes known to all faithful Bohemians who love and shall love God, his desire and unworthy prayer, that they may abide in the grace of God, may end therein, and may abide with God for ever and ever. Faithful and beloved friends and beloved in God! it hath furthermore occurred to me to write, that ye may know how the council, proud, covetous, and full of all abomination, hath condemned my books in the Bohemian language, which it hath neither heard nor seen, nor if it had heard them, would it have understood them. For in the council were Frenchmen, Italians, Englishmen, Spaniards, Germans, and others of other languages, save that John, Bishop of Litomysl, who was there, may have understood them somewhat, as well as other Bohemians, the instigators thereof, from the chapters of Prague and the Vyssegrad, from whom has proceeded the shaming of God's truth and of our Bohemian land, which I hope is a land of most excellent faith, observing its earnest desire with regard to the Word of God and to the customs. Oh, were you to see this council, which calls itself the 'most holy' council, and asserts that it cannot err, verily ye would espy abomination exceeding great, of which I have heard commonly from the Swabians, that

Constance, or 'Kostnice,' their city, will not within thirty years be rid of the sins which this council has committed in their city; and I say furthermore, that all men have been offended through this council, and some have spit, because they saw abominable things. And I say unto you, that when I stood before the council, seeing how little order there was, I said aloud, when all were silent, 'I thought there would have been greater reverence and goodness and better order in this council than there is.' Then said the chief cardinal, 'How speakest thou? In the castle thou speakest more humbly.' And I answered, saying, 'Yes, for in the castle no man clamoured against me, but here all clamour.' And since this council, which hath done more evil than good, hath proceeded with such disorder, faithful Christians and beloved in God! do not allow yourselves to be frightened by their decree, which I hope to God will not profit them; they will fly different ways, like moths, and their ordinance will stand like a spider's web. They wanted to terrify me, but through God's good help they have been unable to prevail over me. They have not thought fit to proceed against me in writing, as heard the gracious lords, who stood up steadfastly for the truth of God, braving all shame, Bohemians, Moravians, and Poles, and especially Lord Wenceslas of Duba and Lord John of Chlum; for, being admitted by King Sigismund into the council, they stood and heard that, when I said, 'I desire instruction! if I have written anything ill, I wish to be instructed!' then said the chief cardinal: 'Since thou wishest to be instructed, this is the instruction: thou hast to recant, as fifty magisters of holy scripture have found.' See! a pretty instruction! Thus St. Catherine, a young damsel, ought to have apostatized from the truth and faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, because fifty magisters were against her. But the dear damsel stood even to death, and brought over to the Lord God the magisters, whom I, sinful man, am not able to bring over. This I write unto you, that ye may know that they have not overcome me by any scripture or any arguments, but have assailed me with cunning and threats, in order to lead me to recantation and renunciation.

But the gracious Lord God, whose law I have magnified, hath been, and is, and I hope will be with me to the end, and will keep me in His grace, even unto death. Written on the Wednesday after St. John Baptist, in prison and in fetters, in expectation of death : still, on account of the divine secrecy, I dare not say that this will be my last letter, for even yet the Omnipotent God can set me free."

It was not by any means his last letter, but his pen was permitted to be occupied several times after it. I conclude my selection from his writings with what was actually his last letter, in which Hus "thanks the underwritten for their kindness," and writes to them (June 29th);—

"God be with you! and may it please Him to give you an everlasting recompense for having done me much good! For my sake, although perhaps dead in the body, do not allow any harm to happen to Lord John, the faithful and worthy knight and my good benefactor, I entreat you for the Lord God's sake, dear Lord Peter, master of the mint, and Lady Anna! Likewise I entreat you to live well and obey God, even as ye have heard. Thank the queen, my gracious lady, from me for all the good that she has done me. Salute her household and other faithful friends, whose names I cannot write at length. I also entreat all to entreat the Lord God and His holy grace for me: we shall ere long meet together by His holy help. Amen. Written in expectation of sentence of death, in prison and in fetters, which I hope I am suffering for the sake of God's law. For the Lord God's sake do not suffer good priests to be destroyed.—Magister Hus, in hope a servant of God.

"Peter, dearest friend! keep the fur coat in remembrance of me.

"Lord Henry Lefl, mayest thou live happily with thy wife, and I thank thee for thy kindness; God be thy recompense!

"Faithful friend, Lord Lidher, with Lady Margaret, Lord Skuoczek, with Mikeska and others! the Lord God give you an

everlasting recompense for the trouble ye have taken, and the other kindnesses which ye have shown me!

“Faithful and dear Magister Christian! the Lord God be with thee!

“Magister Martin, my scholar! remember what I have faithfully taught thee. Magister Nicholas, priest Peter, the king’s chaplain, and other magisters and priests! be diligent in the Word of God! Priest Havlik! preach the Word of God. And I entreat all to be steadfast in God’s truth.”

The British reader is now for the first time enabled to attain full knowledge of one of the most extraordinary men and martyrs that have suffered for truth and righteousness since life and immortality were brought to light by the Son of God. Without a knowledge of Hus’s Bohemian works it is impossible fully to realize either his power or his character, nor could the mighty events that eventually followed his martyrdom have come to pass without those works. As a school divine, his influence would have been limited to the learned; as a writer in his own tongue, he spoke to the hearts and souls of the whole people of what was then the best educated nation in Europe. Every effort was made after the destruction of the liberties of Bohemia in 1620, to destroy its literature; for a hundred and fifty years Jesuit “missionaries” committed every Bohemian book that they could lay their hands on to the flames. But with the abolition of the Austrian censorship of the press in the year of revolutions, 1848, a new era dawned, and Bohemians like Palacky, Erben, Tomek, and others have been able to search and publish freely.

Of their labours I have availed myself to the fullest extent, and my only fear is that I have myself failed in exhibiting this great and good Bohemian and the movement of which he was the head in all their dignity and in all their fulness.

CHAPTER XIII.

JEROME OF PRAGUE.

JEROME OF PRAGUE, the friend and disciple of John Hus, has hitherto held the position of a mere shadow of his greater master, until, after that master's martyrdom, he passes once for all across the stage in a blaze of light in the eloquent letter of Poggio Bracciolini. Of himself, comparatively speaking, little has been known, and, in fact, such precautions were taken in the dominions of the House of Hapsburg, from and after the commencement of the Thirty Years' War, to prevent anything that might tell against the Church of Rome or in favour of the detested heretics of Bohemia from coming to light, that neither original historical research nor correction of errors was possible. Some relaxation of this intellectual bondage began contemporaneously with the movements that inaugurated the great French Revolution, but it was not till 1848, the year of revolutions, that the Austrian censorship of the press was abolished, and its evil head has not since been raised for the

suppression of inquiry and the mutilation of truth. Now the historian is free in Austria, and even in the much-suspected Bohemia, where the great moral, intellectual, and religious movement, known under the name of the Hussite movement, originated, worked, lasted two centuries, and eventually came to a violent end.

Very welcome, therefore, is the republication of a manuscript in the Bohemian language, existing in the library of the gymnasium at Freiburg in Saxony, which appeared in 1878 at Prague under the careful editorship of Dr. Jaroslav Goll, giving an account of the arrest, trial, and martyrdom of Jerome of Prague, well worthy of comparison with the celebrated letter of Poggio Bracciolini, and evidently from the same source as, though adding interesting matter to, the Latin account given in the Nuremburg edition of Hus's Latin works (vol. ii. pp. 522-528), which professes to have been sent to Prague by an eyewitness. This manuscript is believed to be very nearly contemporary with the events that it records, and appears to have been twice printed with the language modernized at the beginning of the seventeenth century; yet, in the general destruction of Bohemian literature, only two copies, one of each edition, are known to have survived, one of which is at Vienna and the other at Prague. And, strange to say, this valuable record, whether in print or in MS., has—to use the words of Dr. Goll—"remained almost entirely unnoticed and unknown to our own times."

Jerome of Prague, Hieronymus de Pragâ, was born about the year 1379, of a well-to-do, but not a noble family in the New Town of Prague. The surname of Faulfisch is commonly given to him in this country, but merely from a confusion between him and a certain Nicholas Faulfisch, one of two students who in 1410 brought to Prague a piece of stone from Wycliffe's tomb, and a forged document from Oxford, sealed with the seal of the university, and dated October 5th, 1406, in which the University of Oxford was made to give the highest commendation to the orthodoxy and moral conduct of Wycliffe. It being commonly said that Jerome was the bringer of Wycliffe's books to Bohemia, a confusion between him and this Faulfisch, in times when historical evidence was sealed up in Austria, was not unnatural. But Jerome's family name is entirely unknown, which would scarcely have been the case, had he been a scion of a noble family in however indigent circumstances.

He was educated entirely at Prague, in the university itself, and previously in the schools connected with it. He became Bachelor of Arts in 1398, and in February, 1399, Hus obtained for him a dispensation from the performance of the duties of a schoolmaster, which were usually required from every Bohemian bachelor during the first two years of his baccalaureate. He then travelled abroad, and in 1401 returned to Prague. The next year he appears to have visited England, and particularly

Oxford, where he copied out Wycliffe's "Dialogus" and "Trialogus" with his own hand. In 1403 he visited Palestine, and two years later we find him in Paris, where he obtained the degree of Master of Arts at the Sorbonne. Here it was that he for the first time became involved in theological difficulties. In a public disputation he took upon himself to maintain that "God cannot annihilate anything." The celebrated chancellor Gerson was anxious to force him to recant his error, but Jerome, finding that arrangements were being made for his arrest, beat a timely retreat and escaped in safety. Thence (1406) he betook himself to the universities of Cologne on the Rhine and Heidelberg, at each of which he took the degree of Master of Arts, and from each of which he was compelled to make his escape owing to difficulties similar to those in which he had been involved at Paris. Here, however, we must bear in mind that philosophy may have had quite as much to do with his troubles as theology or religion. For Jerome was a "Realist" in philosophy, and was thus always more or less in danger of persecution from the then dominant sect of "Nominalists," especially if, as appears to have been the case, he got the better of his opponents in argument. In 1407, he took the degree of Master of Arts at Prague, after which he undertook another journey to Oxford, whither his evil reputation had arrived before him. Preparations were made to arrest him on suspicion of heresy, and it was only by the

exertions of some important personage, who interested himself in him "as if he were his own son," that he was enabled to extricate himself from danger. The following two years he seems to have spent at Prague, where he took part in the agitation which resulted in the inversion of the very peculiar constitution of the university, and the transference of the majority of votes from foreigners to Bohemians, a consequence whereof was the emigration of the great mass of German magisters and students from Prague.

In 1410, early in January, the so-called annual disputation "*de quolibet*," "about what you please," took place at Prague according to custom, in which all magisters were bound to take part and answer one, who was elected "*Magister Quodlibetarius*," and maintained certain theses against all comers. The office of "*Quodlibetarius*" was declined by all the older magisters and fell to a young magister, Matthew of Knin, who had been cited a year and a half previously by the archbishop on suspicion of Wycliffism. The audience was large and distinguished, and Jerome delivered a laudatory oration respecting the young and gifted *Quodlibetarius*, in which he deplored the uneasiness to which he had been subjected, rejected emphatically the general custom of speaking of the Bohemians as a nation of heretics, declared the calumnies uttered against the nation by unpatriotic and corrupt priests to be false, and in particular urged the magistrates of Prague, who were present, to defend the Bohemian

community of their city against such lying slanders with all their might. He moreover enunciated in general terms his opinion of the books of Wycliffe, saying that he had read and studied them like those of any other doctor, and had learnt much that was good from them ; but that he was far from holding as matters of faith everything that he read in them, for that was due to holy scripture only. He therefore counselled students to read those books frequently and study them diligently, especially such of them as bore upon the Faculty of Arts ; but if they found therein anything that they could not understand, to put it aside till a ripener age, for there were some things in them that appeared to be contrary to the faith. These things, therefore, they should neither hold nor defend, but submit to the faith ; and they should also refrain from lending the books to people who were incapable of understanding them. This speech in favour of Wycliffe's writings was afterwards one of the articles of accusation against Jerome at Constance.

The bull of Pope Alexander V. in condemnation of Wycliffe's books arrived two months later, *i.e.* about the middle of March, and ere long commenced the grand struggle between Hus and Archbishop Zbynek, in which Hus appealed first to Pope Alexander and then to his successor, the wicked John XXIII. Jerome had travelled into Hungary, and on "Green Thursday," our "Maunday Thursday," delivered such an oration at King Sigismund's court on the condition of ecclesiastical affairs, that

the clergy felt actual terror lest the temporal lords should be excited to rise up against them. Just at this time arrived a letter from the Archbishop of Prague directed against Jerome, in consequence of which he was imprisoned but set at liberty again in a fortnight's time.

But when, later in the same year, he exhibited himself at Vienna, Andrew Grillenberg, the official of the Bishop of Passau, ordered him at once to be arrested and brought before his tribunal on the charge of holding and disseminating Wycliffite heresy. At his first hearing Jerome denied all the charges, which were brought against him in writing, whereupon the official appointed the procurator of the treasury to conduct the process against him, and fixed a time for the production of witnesses against the accused. These witnesses testified with one voice against Jerome, and in his presence took their corporal oaths in confirmation of their statements. Hereupon, it is said, he altered his tone and promised amendment and recantation of his errors. The official, seeing the alteration that had taken place in him, administered an oath to him in the presence of many Doctors of Theology and Law and other members of the university, that, under penalty of excommunication, he (Jerome) had no intention of quitting Vienna, until the process against him was concluded, but would be always in readiness to obey the citation of the official and appear before his tribunal. Upon taking this oath he was set at liberty, whereupon the official kindly proposed to

him, both for better security against his enemies and also to lessen his expenses, to come and live at his (the official's) own house, where he would be provided with board and lodging gratis during the continuance of the process. Jerome declined the offer with thanks, saying that for the time he had no need of any such assistance. Meanwhile he made known his difficulties to his friends at Prague by letter, and they lost not a moment in employing all possible means of assisting him. The University of Prague itself wrote an angry letter to that of Vienna, bitterly reproaching it with the wrong done to one of its magisters. The rector and magisters also wrote an intercessory letter to the burgomaster and magistrates of Vienna on behalf of their distinguished associate, complaining of the grievous wrong done to him through the malice and envy of certain magisters and students in their town, and requesting their aid against such oppressive conduct on the part of his private enemies. In another letter they bore testimony to the official himself respecting the good behaviour of Magister Jerome, thanked him for the kindness showed towards him, and requested him to add a suitable ending to a good beginning, and not to act according to the will of insensates, who in blind fury were endeavouring to give Jerome over to death.

Jerome, meanwhile, regardless of his oath, took advantage of the first opportunity that presented itself, and before the time for his appearance in court to bring forward his defence against the

witnesses had come, departed secretly from Vienna and escaped into Moravia. From the castle of Bitow there he greeted the official with a jeering letter, in which he informed him that he was merry and well among kind friends at Bitow, and requested him to forgive him for not keeping his promise, it having been extorted from him by force. He had no intention (he said) of eluding justice, but, perhaps, the official himself, if he really loved him, would not advise him to stand alone amongst so many hundred enemies. For the time the cord was broken and he himself at liberty; but the official could send his adversaries and their witnesses to Prague, and proceed at law with him there, or else before the Roman chair, where both parties were equally known. Furthermore, he wished him to know that on his way he had been in his church at Laa (where the official was rector or "plebanus"), and being not unmindful of his kindness, had given an invitation to the school-master and town clerk, and that he was in other respects at his service.

This uncourteous epistle naturally irritated the worthy official, who issued one more citation against Jerome, which he caused to be affixed to the door of St. Stephen's church at Vienna, allowing him the term of eight days to appear before his tribunal, and answer for the violation of his oath and his flight. As of course Jerome did not appear, the official proceeded to excommunicate him, and gave notice thereof by letter to Archbishop

Zbynek (September 30th), by whom Jerome was consequently excommunicated, as he was also at Grillenberg's request by the Bishop of Cracow.

The next appearance of Jerome in public was in 1412, on the arrival of the bulls which had been issued by John XXIII., denouncing as heretics the antipope Gregory XII. and his ally Ladislaw, King of Naples, proclaiming a crusade against Ladislaw, and offering plenary indulgences to all who should either take part in the war personally or furnish the pope with pecuniary assistance towards it. In May the papal legates or commissioners arrived and commenced the sale of the indulgences. Hus preached publicly against them, and, eventually, a public meeting was held in the great hall of the Carolinum on the 7th of June. Here Hus delivered his opinion against the indulgences, his most zealous partisan being Jerome, who supported his views in a long and eloquent speech, and at length, becoming excited, sprang from his seat and declared that he would go that instant to the town hall and maintain before the magistrates that the indulgences were illegal. Up rose a number of students desirous to go with him, nor was it without difficulty that the rector of the university succeeded by friendly argument in diverting Jerome from his purpose. "Hearest thou, Magister Marek!" replied Jerome; "anyhow thou wilt not give thy head for me; I shall give my own neck for myself." Eventually, however, he allowed himself to be calmed down, and the

disputation ended in the ordinary manner. But the students, excited to enthusiasm by Jerome's powerful speech, accompanied him to his abode in greater numbers than accompanied Hus himself.

On the 20th of June Prague was entertained with an unusual spectacle, got up by one of King Wenceslas's favourites, Lord Woksa of Waldstein, who is said to have been assisted therein by Jerome. A satirical procession came forth on the Kleinseite of Prague, in which a student stood in a handsome carriage dressed up as a professional harlot. On his neck and wrists he wore silver bells according to the fashion of the day, which he kept constantly ringing; and suspended to him in front were documents prepared in imitation of those which issued from the papal chancery, with bulls, *i.e.* papal seals, appended to them. Before and behind him went a number of rioters, partly students, armed with swords or staves, to the number of some hundreds, while others, dressed as executioners, cried out that they were conducting the bulls and writings of a ruffian and heretic to be publicly burnt as erroneous and heretical. After traversing the Kleinseite, the procession crossed the bridge into the Old Town, and thence into the New Town, stopping finally at what is now the "Karlsplatz," where the documents were burnt under the pillory, amidst a large and noisy crowd of spectators. Afterwards, a good many young men, instigated, it is said, by Jerome, went about

the town from church to church at sermon time, and wherever the preachers were recommending the indulgences, contradicted them loudly, calling them liars and impostors; for the indulgences (said they) were utterly null and void.

About September, 1412, Hus was obliged to leave Prague, whither he was never able to return for long, but occupied himself with writing and with preaching in the country. But Jerome had already accepted an invitation from Witold, Grand Prince of Lithuania, who wished to consult some one of the more distinguished magisters of Prague—most probably on the subject of the relations between the Latin and Eastern Churches in the Russian and Lithuanian lands, which formed part of his dominions—and who so suitable as the travelled and accomplished Jerome? By the end of March, 1412, Jerome was already at Cracow, where he had full access to the court of King Wenceslas of Poland. The first day he wore his long hanging whiskers, but on the morrow he exhibited himself as a perfect Polish gentleman—to use the words of Albert, Bishop of Cracow, in a letter to Prague—“without whiskers, in a red coat and a cap bordered with miniver, haughtily before the king the queen, the princes, lords, and nobles.” From the same letter we learn that “though he stayed there but a few days, he yet excited more sensation among the clergy and people than had been excited in that diocese within the memory of man.” In April he went on to Witold and travelled with him

as far as Witebsk and Pskov, and then returned to Wilna. Being asked whether people in those districts who had come over from the Russian to the Latin Church ought to be rebaptised, he answered in the negative, and recommended that they should merely be instructed in the ordinances of the Church which they had joined. At Witebsk and Pskov the Latin clergy were offended at the recognition he accorded to the faithful of the Russian Church, at his visiting their churches and taking part in their processions.

Reports were spread that he had visited the King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania for the purpose of perverting them from the faith, and it was even rumoured that he had himself joined the Russian Church. At Cracow he was questioned by the archbishop in presence of the pope's legate and many other dignitaries, as to the forty-five articles selected for condemnation from the writings of Wycliffe, but his simple reply was that he rejected the tenour of the said articles.

When Hus—in violation of King Sigismund's safe-conduct—was on November 23rd, 1414, taken from his lodgings at Constance and cruelly imprisoned, several of his friends contemplated going thither to assist and stand by him. But as soon as he received intelligence of their intention, he wrote to warn them against any such thing. However, Magister Christian of Prachatitz went and obtained an interview with Hus in his prison some time before the 4th of March, 1415. And before

Magister Christian could have returned, Jerome of Prague had also entered upon his journey thither, moved no doubt by a kind of chivalrous feeling and honourable obligation, as he had himself urged Hus to go to the council and even promised to follow him thither, that they might both publicly prove their orthodoxy and purify the reputation of their country. On April 4th, 1415, Jerome exhibited himself unexpectedly to Hus's friends at Constance, who earnestly entreated him to go back before he was recognized. He was persuaded indeed to withdraw to a neighbouring town, probably Ueberlingen, whence, on April 7th, he sent letters to Constance, which he caused to be affixed to the city gates, to the church doors, and to the cardinal's houses, wherein he requested King Sigismund and the council to grant him a safe-conduct to appear freely before the council and answer everybody publicly, who desired to accuse him of any error or heresy. Receiving no answer for two days, he obtained written testimony of the fact from the Bohemian lords then staying at Constance, waited five days longer, and then commenced his return journey to Bohemia with the document in his possession.

It was not till April 17th, that the council determined to issue a citation against him, which was placarded the next day in various places in Constance, giving him notice that he could have a safe-conduct from the council against violence, but not against due course of law. In all probability in entire ignorance of this citation, Jerome arrived on

April 20th at the town of Hirschau, about twenty-five English miles from the Bohemian frontier, belonging to the dominions of the Count Palatine, John, son of Ruprecht, the late rival of Wenceslas of Bohemia as King of the Romans. Here he was recognized by the clergy, arrested by the Burgrave of the Castle, and conducted back to Sulzbach, the residence of Count John. By him intelligence was sent at once to the council, which requested the prince to send the prisoner at once to Constance.

On May 23rd, Magister Jerome was conducted to Constance and delivered in the first place to the Count Palatine Louis, John's brother. Louis led him in a kind of triumphal procession from his residence to the place where the council was assembled, marching himself before the carriage on which was Jerome, bound with heavy fetters and surrounded by armed men. To the manacle which the prisoner had on his hand was attached a long chain, held by his guards, and by it they led him into the hall where the council was sitting.

When he was there set, fettered with chains, before the bishops, his citation was read, which had been placarded in various places over against his own notifications. And forthwith one of the bishops said to Magister Jerome: "Jerome, why didst thou flee? and when cited, why didst thou not appear?" He replied: "Because I could not have a safe-conduct from you or the king, as is proved by those letters of the lords, which ye have. Neither after the letters, which I published openly

in the towns, could I obtain such safe-conduct. Observing therefore the devices of my enemies, I departed, that I might not be the cause of mine own death. But had I known aught of your citation, even if I had been in Bohemia, I should have come to Constance." Hereupon arose a great multitude against Magister Jerome, testifying and accusing him with great outcry. And when they were silent, an old doctor, the chancellor of Paris (Gerson), said : "Jerome, when thou wast in Paris, thou didst imagine thyself an angel in thine eloquence, and didst set the whole University of Paris in an uproar, making many erroneous and scandalous speeches." To him Magister Jerome answered very gently : "Reverend magister, as to all those speeches and theses, which I made and laid down argumentatively at Paris in the general school, according to the course and order of magisters, answering the oppositions and objections of magisters according to my magisterhood, I was not then accused thereof, but was accepted as a magister of the University of Paris. And as to what I said formerly in my thesis, if ye allow me, I will lay down the selfsame position before all the council ; and if it be proved that there is aught erroneous therein, I will gladly amend it and also humbly receive better instruction."

Thereat another magister of the University of Cologne on the Rhine, who was sitting there, arose and said : "Jerome, with us at Cologne thou didst lay down many errors in thy thesis, and that is

remembered to this day." To him Magister Jerome said thus: "Prithee, tell me openly one error." Somewhat ashamed, he said: "I do not remember now, but hereafter they will be brought against thee."

Then a third from Heidelberg arose and said: "When thou wast with us, thou didst lay down various errors, in particular respecting the Holy Trinity, when thou didst paint a shield, likening the Holy Trinity to water, snow and ice." To this speech Magister Jerome replied thus: "What I then said, wrote, and painted, I am willing to say, write, and paint here also; and if it be proved that there is aught erroneous therein, I will gladly, gently, and humbly recant and give place to better instruction."

After this speech others standing by cried out: "Burn him! Burn him!" He answered: "If ye desire my execution and death, God's will be done!" Then said the "English Archbishop;"* "No; Jerome; for it is written: 'I will not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live.'"

When this preliminary hearing was over, Jerome was placed under the surveillance of John Wallenrode, Bishop of Riga, and conducted by the beadles of the city of Constance to a house, the site of which is unknown. A certain Bohemian, getting to know of this house, came to the window and said thus to Magister Jerome: "Dear magister,

* It was the Bishop of Salisbury, Robert Hallam.

cheer up and be steadfast, and fear not to undergo death for the truth's sake. Yea, thou didst discourse much of death, when thou wast at liberty." Jerome replied: "Dear brother, I thank thee for thy visit, and be assured that I do not fear death. We have formerly talked much of it, now we must make trial indeed of what it can do." * The guards overhearing, though probably not understanding the conversation, drove the Bohemian from the window, and Jerome was then removed into a tower near St. Paul's churchyard, where he was put into the stocks, fettered hand and foot, and given nothing but bread and water till he became seriously ill. In his illness he asked for a confessor, a request which was eventually granted, and his imprisonment rendered less cruel.

Soon after the burning of Hus on July 6th, 1415, further steps were taken by the council in the matter of Jerome. On the 19th, an inquiry was held in his prison as to certain articles of the accusations which had been framed against him. The severity of his imprisonment and physical weakness from illness so far overcame him, that he eventually allowed himself to be induced to promise recantation, a promise which he performed in two public sittings of the council on the 11th and 23rd of September. He renounced the doctrines of Wycliffe and Hus, which he was accused of holding, as heretical, erroneous, and scandalous, acknowledged

* A treatise on death is ascribed to Jerome by Blahoslaw. It is not, however, extant.

the rightfulness of Hus's condemnation, submitted in all respects to the decision of the council, and promised to write to that effect himself to the King and Queen of Bohemia, to the University of Prague, and to other persons. In fact, he did write such a letter in the Bohemian language, which is still extant, to Lord Laczko of Krawary, one of the three chiefs of the "union" of the Bohemian lords. As it is the only relic of his writings in his own tongue, I give it *in extenso*. It is to a great extent couched in the very words of his recantation :—

"In the first place, my service, dear and noble lord, and my especial benefactor! I give thy grace to know that I am alive and well at Constance. I hear that there has been a great storm, both in Bohemia and in Moravia, since the death of Magister Hus, as if he had been wrongfully condemned and violently burned. Therefore I write this of good will, as to my lord, that thou mayest know what course to take; therefore by this letter I beg thee, take not up his cause, to maintain that wrong hath been done him. Of my knowledge that hath been done with him which ought to have been done with him. And think not, my lord, that I have written this under compulsion, or have fallen away from him for any terror. I was kept strictly in prison, and many great magisters laboured with me and could not bring me from this idea. And I thought that wrong had been done him. But when those passages of his, for which he was condemned, were given me to look over, I looked them over very carefully, and weighing them in my mind with several magisters, I saw fully that some of those passages were heretical, some erroneous, and others tending to produce scandal and mischievous. But I still doubted somewhat, not being satisfied that the passages were by that unhappy man, but I hoped they were extracts from his discourses and fragments which altered his meaning. And I began to ask seriously for his

own books, and the council gave me them for perusal, written with his own hand. Thus, with celebrated magisters of holy writ, I verified the passages for which he was burnt, and compared them with books written with his own hand, and found all those passages standing fully in those senses in his books. And therefore I cannot honestly say otherwise, than that that unhappy man wrote many erroneous and mischievous passages ; and I, who was his friend and the defender of his honour with mine own lips on all sides, having ascertained this, will not be a defender of those errors, as I have also voluntarily acknowledged before the council at greater length. And now I have too much to do to write at such length, but I expect I shall soon, please God, write what has happened to me at length and send it to thy grace. And herewith I commend myself to thy love. Written with mine own hand at Constance the Thursday immediately after the Nativity of the Mother of God " (September 12th).

Full confidence, however, was not placed in his recantation, partly, perhaps, owing to his escape from Vienna in 1410, as above related, partly, no doubt, owing to a conversation which King Sigismund had held with a number of the prelates and cardinals after Hus's hearing on June 8th, 1415, in which he had advised them to place no faith in any recantations, but to make short work with both Hus and his disciples, " especially with the fellow who is detained here." They said : " With Jerome ? " The king replied : " Yes, Jerome. We will finish with him in less than a day ; it will be easier work ; for the other is the master, and that Jerome is his disciple." However, Jerome's imprisonment in the tower was now rendered much less severe, although the fetters were still on his legs, and careful watch was kept by guards.

The cardinals who had been appointed judges in his case, Peter d'Ailly of Cambray and Francesco Zabarella of Florence, were inclined to allow of his being released from prison. But some of Jerome's personal enemies, especially Michael de Causis and Stephen Palecz, "faithless renegades," as the Bohemian MS. calls them, opposed it vigorously, in which they were aided by the celebrated John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, who had in September, 1415, composed a treatise on the thesis, that even after recantation a man must always remain under suspicion of heresy. Uncircumspect words spoken by Jerome were welcomed in confirmation of these views, and that the more when he deferred sending the promised letters to the King and Queen of Bohemia and to the University of Prague, and finally altogether refused to write them.

The matter came before the council on February 24th, and when the two cardinals expressed themselves in favour of Jerome's liberation, Dr. Naz, whose acquaintance we have already made during Hus's trial, went so far as to insinuate that they had been bribed by the heretics or by the King of Bohemia. Offended at this, they resigned their office as judges, and two others were appointed in their stead, John, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Nicholas of Dinkensbühl, a Doctor of Theology. These men commenced a new investigation, but Jerome refused to answer their questions in a satisfactory manner, demanding a public hearing in

the council, and promising to state and disclose his final sentiments. Such a hearing he obtained on the 23rd and 26th of May, one day being insufficient for dealing with all the articles of accusation, which were one hundred and seven in number.

It will perhaps be most interesting if I follow rather the simple narrative of the hitherto unused Bohemian MS. than the eloquent rhetoric of Poggio Bracciolini's well-known letter, merely using the latter occasionally to supplement the former.

On the Saturday before Ascension-day, Magister Jerome was brought into the great church for a public hearing, when one hundred and seven articles were brought forward against him, and it was stated that he was convicted by witnesses with regard to them and condemned. But since he had demanded a public hearing it was allowed him. Then Magister Jerome, with good thought and very cleverly—sufficiently so, had he never been in prison—replied to some of the articles until noon-day, declaring with regard to those articles, which had been invented against him, that he was not guilty of them, rejecting all the witnesses, and affirming that they had witnessed and testified against him maliciously and falsely as his enemies.

Likewise on the Tuesday afterwards he replied to the remainder of the articles, ascribing untruthfulness to his accusers and answering each of them calmly when they testified against him, so that he brought some of them to shame and some to silence by his answers. Yea, when asked by one what he

held as to the sacrament of the altar, he answered thus: "Before consecration it is bread and wine, after consecration the true body of Christ and His holy blood;" adding more thereto that is proper according to the true faith.

Then another arose and said: "But, Jerome, there is a very great rumour concerning thee, that thou also holdest that it is bread upon the altar." He replied: "I hold that it is bread only with the baker, but not in the sacrament of the altar." Against this a monk all in white very uncourteously said thus: "Why deniest thou this? Anyhow, it is a manifest thing." He shouted, "Silence, hypocritical monk!"

When this one held his peace, another cried with great outcry and said: "I swear on my conscience, as to that which thou deniest, that it is so." To him he answered: "Thus to swear on one's conscience is oft the easiest way to deceive."

And when no hold could be obtained either therein or in aught else, nor anything had worthy of condemnation—for he replied calmly to all and brought them to silence—then and not till then did he ask and obtain a quiet hearing, and spoke before them till past noon of various learning and the writings of philosophers and the scriptures, of God's law and the doctors, and that very deeply and masterly, so that all had whereat to marvel, citing by name various philosophers, apostles, prophets, and martyrs, how they had for the truth's sake been without guilt persecuted, condemned,

held for disturbers of peace, convicted as blasphemers of God, and had therefore been sentenced to death and murdered in various ways. "And forsooth," said he, "if it is unrighteousness when this is done by foreigners or natives to an ordinary person, it is a greater unrighteousness when one priest suffers from another, and the greatest unrighteousness when a priest is given up to death by a council of priests from malice and hatred." In all this Magister Jerome spake very steadfastly and manfully, so that he spake nought unworthy that would not become a good man.

Afterwards Magister Jerome proceeded to himself, giving an account of his life and his sins, and his adventures in various lands, till he touched upon this, how he had laboured under King Wenceslas for this end, that Bohemians should have a superior right to everything above all other nations, especially above the Germans, and possess the chief authority in the University of Prague.

Afterwards he applied himself to speaking of Magister John Hus, whom he had known from his youth, how he was a man neither licentious, nor covetous, nor a drunkard, nor defiled with other open sins, but that he was humble, honourable, sober, diligent in teaching and reading, a righteous, faithful, and holy preacher, and whatsoever Magister John Hus and Magister John Wycliffe had preached against the wickedness, pride, malice, ruffianism, and avarice of the priesthood, all this he held and would hold unto death. As regarded

the other articles of the Christian faith, he held and believed them all according to the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, assenting to no error or heresy.

Finally, he said this also, that although he had incurred guilt against the good Lord God, yet were there no sins so grievous on his conscience, as that sin which he had committed in that villainous and accursed pulpit, wherein in his recantation for fear of death he had assented to the unrighteous condemnation of Magister John Hus, a holy man, speaking against him unjustly to please them. Now that the Lord God had aided him to enter the self-same pulpit again, he cancelled, annulled, and revoked that recantation, asserting that wrong and injury had been done to Magister John Hus by the council, asserting, too, that what he had said against Magister John Hus to please them, he had said unjustly, and was heartily sorry for it.

During these speeches of Magister Jerome, which he spoke at the beginning, many felt themselves inclined towards his liberation, but on account of the end they were exasperated at him, saying: "Now hath he sentenced himself." He was, therefore, immediately led back to prison, where he was fettered very heavily with chains—feet, hands, and waist.

Two days were given him for change of mind, during which he was visited and reasoned with by the most learned magisters, especially Cardinal Zabarella of Florence, but in vain.

Then, on the Saturday before Ascension (May

30th), Magister Jerome was brought into the great church, where a multitude of prelates, monks, and other priestly persons had assembled for his final condemnation, together with a large number of armed men. He was then bidden to abide by what he had done at his first recantation, and give up his laudation of Magister Wycliffe and Magister John Hus. To this Magister Jerome answered very forcibly and courageously, without any fear, rebuked them for their disorders, and said thus: "I take to witness the Lord my God, and declare before you, that I hold nought heretical and nought erroneous, but that I hold and believe all the articles of the Christian faith, as the Holy Catholic Church holds and believes. But to the condemnation of the good magisters aforesaid, whom ye have unrighteously and maliciously condemned, because they taught and wrote of your disorderly life to your reproof and correction, I will not assent, although I am therefore to be now sentenced by you to death. God's will be done! but I will not act against my conscience; for I know, that in what they have written against the disorders and unrighteousness of the priesthood, they have set down the truth."

After this the Bishop of Lodi ascended the pulpit, and urged the whole council to the condemnation of Jerome, founding his discourse on the words of the Gospel of St. Mark (xiv. 14): "The Lord Christ upbraided their unbelief and hardness of heart."

“Let the holy council, as it punished the unbelief of the faithless heretics, John Wycliffe and John Hus, condemning their doctrines as erroneous, heretical, and injurious to the Holy Church—let it punish Magister Jerome, their follower, who is stiffnecked, wilful, audacious, and obstinate in his malice, and let it take vengeance upon him, that others, who might wish to take up the same, seeing that he was not forgiven, may not spring up. But, if any such should appear, who should thus defile the Holy Church, any witnesses whatever, even of evil repute, as ruffians, thieves, harlots, ought to be received against them; yea, if that were not enough, they ought to be tortured with various tortures until they acknowledged their errors, and afterwards rooted out and destroyed, unless they were willing to give way and recant, that mercy might be shown them. But to thee, Jerome, it will not be granted, since thou hast taken again into thy throat, what thou hadst first recanted, doing this to great scandal and to the insult of the holy council, and returning like a dog to thy heretical vomit. Therefore, in its sentence against thee, whatever the holy council doth, it doth properly and rightfully.”

After the conclusion of this and many other discourses, Magister Jerome spoke to them exceedingly intelligently and cleverly, with a good memory and boldness, declaring that what was being done to him was being done lawlessly and unrighteously. “I hold,” said he, “no erroneous or heretical articles contrary to the Christian faith, neither have I imagined or brought forward aught against the estate or order of the Catholic Christian Church, save what is against a wicked, proud, and disorderly priesthood; and I have often complained, and that with sorrow, that they thus behave contrary to their consecration and order.” And he declared that neither therein nor in aught

else had they any fit cause for sentencing him to death. If, then, they relied on witnesses over and above this his faithful and honest confession, he declared expressly that such witnesses were false witnesses, neither ought credence to be given them, for all that they had brought against him they had not brought honestly, but from anger, malice, and hatred.

Then some of them, hearing this language of his, advised him to make, as had been offered him, a recantation like unto his first one; else, if he did not so do, it would go hard with him. Then, seeing that it was drawing nigh to death for him, he said thus: "Ye wish to condemn me wrongfully and miserably, without any certain charge. I leave you as a legacy after my death a sting and gnawing to pierce your consciences, and I cite you before the Most High and Righteous Judge, the Lord God Almighty, to answer me before Him at the end of a hundred years."

This they turned into ridicule, and forthwith ordered the sentence, which they held ready framed in many words against him, to be read to this effect: That the holy council of Constance now cuts off Jerome of Prague from the root, as a rotten and withered branch, for his errors, audacity, and obstinacy, and because he hath condemned his first recantation, contrary to the honour of the holy council, as a damned and accursed heretic, and finally delivers him over to the secular power, that it may take him, and execute worthy vengeance upon him for his great wickedness.

After this sentence they brought before Magister Jerome a great and tall crown, painted round about with red devils, that he might go in it to death. On espying it, he took off his cap, threw it among the prelates, and taking the crown on his hand, said: "My Lord Jesus Christ, when dying for me, miserable man that I am, had on his head a more grievous crown of thorns. I, too, for His grace and love will gladly bear this blasphemous crown upon me to death."

Forthwith the beadies took hold of him and led him out of the church. On the way, going cheerfully on, he chanted the Catholic creed, as it is chanted in church, from beginning to end, with a loud voice, raising his eyes to heaven. On finishing this he commenced other hymns, both of the mother of God and of other saints. And thus continuously singing he came to the place where they had previously burned Magister John Hus. Here he knelt on his knees at the stake, which had been prepared for his burning, and prayed within himself very meekly for a good while. Then the executioners raised him, stripped him or made him strip himself of his garments, and put a foul cloth on his loins. They then cruelly bound him standing to the stake, which was fixed in the ground, with ropes and chains. And when they began to place the wood around him, mingling straw with it, he chanted with a clear voice the Easter hymn: "*Salve, festa dies!*" singing it to the end. He finished with the Catholic creed, and thereupon raised his

voice to the people standing by, saying thus in German : "Dear people, know that I believe even as I have just chanted. Likewise, as to the other articles of the faith, I believe as every Christian ought to believe. But I am now dying, because I would not assent to the priestly council's sentence and condemnation of Magister John Hus, as just and rightful ; for I knew the magister from my youth up, that he was an honourable and noble man, and a preacher of the faith of God's law and of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

The executioners having now surrounded him with wood up to the crown of the head behind and up to the breast in front, and placed his garments on the logs, were about to light the fire behind his back, that he might not see it. "Come here," said he, "and light the fire in my sight ; if I had feared it, I should never have come to this place." He then chanted with a loud voice : "Into thy hands, Lord God, I commit my soul." After this, when the violence of the fire caught him, he cried out in the Bohemian tongue : "Lord God Almighty, have mercy on me ! Forgive me my sins ! For Thou knowest that I have loved Thy holy truth." When the flame struck him, he prayed within himself a good while, until thus doing he died.

Afterwards they brought his bed-clothes and other things, burned them all to dust, placed them on a cart, and cast them into the Rhine.

Such was the end of the most brilliant—I do not say, able—man and scholar of his day. It is

manifest that he could never have excited such storms in foreign universities had he not been an overmatch for his opponents in eloquence, learning, and disputation. Various circumstances above related throw more or less light upon his extraordinary powers. But it is to Poggio Bracciolini that we must look for the fullest testimony to his ability as an orator and disputer. Poggio was well used to the society of the great, the learned and the eloquent; yet his admiration of Jerome transcends all ordinary limits, and is expressed in terms of real and genuine and not merely of rhetorical and affected feeling.

"I own," says he, "that I never saw any one, who in pleading a cause, especially one for life and death, approached more nearly to the eloquence of the ancients, whom we admire so much. It is marvellous to have seen, with what words, what eloquence, what arguments, what expression of countenance, what visage, what confidence, he answered his adversaries and finally concluded the pleading of his cause. . . . Many he smote with jests, many with invectives; many he frequently compelled to laugh in what was no laughing matter, by jeering at the reproaches made to him by his adversaries. . . . This, however, was a token of the greatest intellectual power, that, when his discourse was frequently interrupted and he was assailed with various outeries by some who carped at his sentiments, not one of them did he leave unscathed, and chastising them all alike, compelled them either to blush or to hold their peace. . . . His voice was sweet, clear, and sonorous, with a certain dignified oratorical gesticulation, either to express indignation, or to move compassion, which, however, he neither asked for nor wished to obtain. He stood fearless and dauntless, not merely despising but even desiring death, so that you would have said he was another Cato."

With his tall stature and powerful build, his long black whiskers, his handsome dress, his eloquent tongue, his graceful carriage, his travelled experience of men and manners, there must have been, as Baron Helfert says, something "heroic" in Jerome's appearance, which could not fail to be extremely fascinating. In one respect he appears not to have been above his day, and that is in the double dealing of his escape from Vienna, when he condescended to meet those who held the maxim, that "no faith need be kept with heretics," by the application of the counter principle, that, conversely, no faith need be kept with them. With this exception no flaw can be found in his moral character, and he stands forth as one of the best men, as well as the most brilliant layman of his day.

It is strange, too, that the condemnation and death of both his master and himself were founded on side issues, and not on direct and genuine unorthodoxy according to the orthodoxy of the times. Hus was put to death because, although willing enough to submit to the instruction, correction, and definition of the council, yet he steadfastly refused to recant doctrines and opinions which he had never held and which he abhorred; Jerome, because he refused to acknowledge that the burning of Hus was just and righteous. Hus was the symbol of the dawn of a moral and religious, Jerome of that of a moral and intellectual insurrection against the corruptions and disorders of the clergy in what was

perhaps the most corrupt and wicked age that the ecclesiastical body has ever known. And the very enormity and almost incredible vastness of the evil, against which their honest voices were raised, is one of the principal things that now stand in the way of the due appreciation of their services to the human race. They and their nation ripened before others, and both they and their nation have paid the penalty which falls upon those who are before their time; they have been denied the recognition and appreciation which they have deserved. The word CZECH is probably derived from the verb CZITI, "to begin;" let Hus and Jerome in particular and the Czeskish or Bohemian nation in general receive the credit due to those who have opened a new path, into which others entered and walked successfully therein. Honour to those who followed their footsteps and carried the sacred banner further and further onwards! But honour, too, to the men and the little Slavonic nation that made the first beginning!

THE END.

me



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

RETURNED TO UCSB I.L.L.

MAY 2 1977

Handwritten scribble or signature.



3 1158 00091 1577

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 786 322 8

